

# CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

AND

## THE REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE, Vol. X.  
REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES, Vol. V.

JANUARY, 1894.

No. 3.  
No. 3.

### THE AMERICAN CHURCHES.

ARMORY H. BRADFORD.

**Dr. Langdon on  
Obstacles to  
Reunion.**

We publish in this number of THE REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES a striking article by the Rev. William Chauncy Langdon, D.D., in which with rare discrimination some of the obstacles in the way of the reunion of Christendom are clearly set forth. Dr. Langdon is an enthusiast on the subject of Christian union. An Episcopalian himself, a man who has spent many years in Europe, where he has had exceptional opportunities for studying this subject, one who is a Christian more than a churchman—and yet a loyal churchman, his words are entitled to the earnest consideration of all interested in this subject, which is coming to the attention of Christendom with altogether unexpected swiftness. We think that Dr. Langdon is right in his main contention, though, perhaps, we should hardly agree with him in placing so much emphasis upon the difficulties which he mentions; but in the spirit of the paper we heartily agree, and we urge all our readers to give especial attention to his weighty words.

**The Chicago-  
Lambert Prop-  
ositions.**

The only one of the Protestant denominations which has made distinct suggestions concerning the subject of the organic union of Christendom is the Anglican in England and the Protestant Episcopal in this country. We speak of them as one church, for they are essentially one. The propositions, we believe, were originally set forth at the recent Lambeth Conference convened at the call of the Archbishop of Canterbury. They have, however, been adopted by the Episcopalian Church of this country, and may, therefore, be considered as the contribution of that church, by way of suggestion, toward the realization of church union. Two or three points should be kept in mind. They were never offered as an *ultimatum*. Neither in England nor in America have their advocates ever said that these four propositions are the only basis of reunion. On the other hand, it is a statement of what the Episcopalian communion regards as essential. They are proposi-

tions for discussion rather than for a final disposition of the subject.

Another point should be carefully heeded. The "Quadrilateral" presents those subjects which are supposed to be essential to organic Christian unity and to have catholic relations. All Protestant Christians are agreed as to three of them, and only concerning the fourth is there serious difficulty. The four propositions are as follows:

"I. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

"II. The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

"III. The two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

"IV. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church."

The fourth proposition, that concerning the Historic Episcopate, excites, as was to be expected, very general controversy. Presbyterians and Congregationalists of various forms object to it for one reason and another. They are not willing to admit that the ordination of their ministers has not been valid and regular, and to them it looks as if the proposition meant practically to say, "You come to us, and we may realize organic union;" but that does not seem to be a fair interpretation of the proposition. The Historic Episcopate has no more relation to the Protestant Episcopal Church than to many other branches of Christendom. As an actual fact nearly eighty per cent. of the Christian world recognize it. It could be realized by Congregationalists and Presbyterians without any other changes in their polity. Probably no amount of argument will make these denominations believe that there is any special force in the claim to the historicity of the Episcopate, or any special value in the historical connection if it could be established, but that is not the important question. The more important one is whether those denom-

inations who care little for the Episcopate would be willing to waive their preferences to satisfy the consciences of those to whom it means much. As a fact we are inclined to think that most Protestants are coming to feel that the Episcopate in some form is a desirable institution. There are evils in machinery; there is also great benefit from having a competent executive head in any work. At this time, however, we desire not to enter into any extended discussion of this subject, but rather in connection with Dr. Langdon's article to place before our readers the Chicago-Lambeth propositions, and to ask for them a fair interpretation and earnest and generous consideration. It must at least be granted that no other denomination of Christians has gone so far as the Episcopalians in the direction of church unity, for they alone have made definite propositions for the realization of that end.

**The Public  
School  
Question.**

The discussion concerning the Public Schools which was started anew by the circular from Baltimore, said to have the approval of both Cardinal Gibbons and Mgr. Satolli, has already shown that the American people are in no mood for any invasion of our public school system by any religious denomination. As a result of the discussion Cardinal Gibbons has disavowed all responsibility for the Baltimore circular, and *The Outlook* in an editorial says: "We have made careful inquiry into the matter, and are officially assured, he has not authorized or approved, and does in fact disavow the petition for the division of the school funds." It is stated that the origin of the petition has been traced to the *Sunday Democrat*, a weekly Roman Catholic journal published in New York. This much at least is made evident, that the present agitation is now repudiated by the hierarchy of this country, whatever the preferences of individual ecclesiastics may be. We are inclined to think that there is reason in the complaint that what one prominent Romanist may advocate is often, and very wrongly, presumed also the voice of the whole church. Individual Roman Catholics have their peculiar ideas, and are constantly expressing them, but they speak for their church no more than individual Protestants do when they utter their private opinions. We grant this most heartily and gladly, but we do not think there ought to be surprise at the feeling of alarm when Mgr. Satolli in a public address speaks as follows: "Grant Heaven that the Catholic schools may continue, increase in number, grow stronger, reach the highest perfection, endowed with the blessings of God, commanded by the authority of the Church and the Holy Father." If Mgr. Satolli had reference only to private schools we should not venture any complaint; but

if he refers to schools which are in any way to be supported or aided by public funds, as it seems to us he clearly does, we submit that "the Holy Father" has no more business with them than the General Conference of Methodists, or the General Assembly of Presbyterians. The public schools furnish such education as the best interests of the State require; if any denomination of Christians desires to give instruction in the peculiar doctrines of its sect the American people and American history unitedly declare that it should pay for it itself and not ask assistance from the public treasury for that sectarian work.

**The Roman Catholic  
Church in  
New York.**

Much has been said during the past few years concerning the way that property in New York City was voted to the Roman Catholic Church without any adequate compensation. We have heard it affirmed again and again that the ground on which the Roman Catholic Cathedral stands on Fifth avenue, as valuable as any other property in the city, was sold to the Church for the nominal sum of one dollar. At the recent meeting of the Presbyterian Union, the Rev. Dr. Burrell made the statement that St. Patrick's Cathedral had better be called "the Cathedral of St. Boodle." He can hardly be blamed since the Mayor of New York, himself a Roman Catholic, had practically said as much in an article in *The North American Review*. When Dr. Burrell made his statement, Smith Ely, who was Mayor of New York at the time that the Cathedral was built, wrote a courteous letter saying that the ground on which the Cathedral was built was honestly purchased, and fully paid for. *The Evangelist*, having had its curiosity excited, requested ex-Mayor Ely to find some one who could speak by authority in regard to the matter, and it publishes, in its issue of December 14th, a long letter from Mr. Henry R. Beekman, former Corporation Council, which settles the matter. We do not think we can do our readers a better service than to quote the conclusion of Mr. Beekman's very interesting letter:

"From the examination of the title thus made, these facts indisputably appear:

"1st. That the bulk of the property in question had been sold and conveyed by the city for a valuable consideration some thirty years before it was purchased by the Cathedral and St. Peter's Church at public auction, under a title derived, through several intermediate owners, from the original grantee of the city.

"2nd. That the rest of the property, consisting of a slender strip bordering the north side of Fiftieth street, five feet six inches wide on Fourth avenue, and ten inches wide on Fifth avenue, was obtained by grant from the city, but in exchange for a similar strip on the south side of Fifty-first

street, which was conveyed by the Cathedral and St. Peter's Church to the city—a full equivalent and a transaction as beneficial to the city as to the Cathedral.

"3rd. That the quit rent of four bushels of wheat reserved in the original grant to Lylburn in 1799, was released by the city upon the payment by the Cathedral of a lump sum in commutation, amounting to \$83.32, which represented a correct and fair capitalization at the time of the rent in question.

"In all of the above transactions the dealing of the city with the Cathedral differed in no wise from a large number of similar ones had by the city with other owners of portions of its common lands; and it is apparent upon the face of the facts, as I have detailed them, that the criticisms which have been passed upon the method of acquisition by the Cathedral of its property are wholly without foundation or justification.

"Yours very truly,  
(Signed) "HENRY R. BECKMAN."

**The Unitarians and Mozoomdar.**

Mr. Mozoomdar, the eloquent Indian, made a very profound impression on his second visit to the United States. His affiliations in this country are chiefly with the Unitarians. His system of thought is eclectic, and one that appeals more directly to Unitarians than to other bodies of Christians. His addresses before the Lowell Institute in Boston, and his preaching in various churches in that city and New York, have won for him a large circle of friends. As he leaves for his home the Unitarians of Boston have issued an appeal in his behalf looking toward the formation of a Mozoomdar Association, which shall be very much like that which is known as the Ramabai Association. A committee of Unitarians has also prepared an address to the Brahmo-Somaj in India, expressing the sympathy of Unitarians in this country with the Brahmo-Somaj and with the work which it is attempting to do. The address is full of fraternal expressions, and must be exceedingly gratifying to the gifted East Indian, whose sweet spirit and eloquent speech have been so attractive during his all too short visit in the United States. However widely we may differ, none of us can fail to recognize the courtesy of many, if not all, of his utterances, and the spirituality which pervades most that he has said during this visit. His reverence for the Christian's Master is outspoken and earnest, and his appeal for the continuance of missionary work in his land one of the strongest to which we have ever listened, notwithstanding his somewhat severe criticism of missionary methods. He will carry back to India the best wishes of all who have had the privilege of listening to him in the United States.

**The New Woman's Settlement in Jersey City.**

In the great growth of philanthropy in our time one of the most interesting of all the movements is that which manifests itself in the University and Social Settlements among the people. These are not in the technical sense missions. They seek to reach the masses by entering into their life and improving its conditions. Usually they are distinctly religious, although their methods sometime give a different impression. The missions aim at the conversion of individuals; they rely upon preaching and upon various social meetings, and their history proves that they are well worth all they cost, and that their number is far too small. On the other hand, they also prove that something more than preaching is needed, and this need in the way of general improvement of life is intended to be met by various "settlements." The most prominent of these are Toynbee Hall, Oxford House and Mansfield House, in London; Andover House, in Boston; Hull House, in Chicago, and the University and College Women's Settlements, in New York. A new movement in this direction is just getting under way. No part of the great metropolitan district is so much neglected as what is known as Lower Jersey City. It embraces a population of about 40,000 and is almost neglected by religious and philanthropic workers. Its population is composed chiefly of young men and women who cross the river because living is cheaper there, of operatives in the numerous factories, of canal boatmen, railroad men and dockers, who must be near their work. This class of people the People's Palace, connected with the Tabernacle Church, but supported by outside help, has been bravely trying to reach. It is no exaggeration to say that it is almost the only Protestant movement which touches the life of these people. Its work is chiefly with men and boys; the women and girls are still without help. With a view to meeting this need a Woman's Settlement has been projected. It will be under the direction of Miss Bradford, a sister of the Rev. Dr. Bradford, of Montclair, N. J. Miss Bradford has spent much time in Mansfield House, East London, and in Hull House, Chicago, becoming thoroughly acquainted with the work to be done. It is proposed to take into the life of the women and girls interesting and helpful amusement; to provide instruction in scientific dressmaking, in physical culture, a free kindergarten for the children, to have afternoon teas, at which the poor women will meet those who will know how to sympathize without humiliating. These are but hints of what it is hoped will be done by this new settlement. The field is perhaps the neediest in the whole region, and the work ought to have the co-operation of a large number of people. Several ladies have al-

ready offered their services as assistants without becoming residents. The principle of the work, we suppose, is well understood. No salaries will be paid to any resident. Women having means of their own join the Settlement, pay their board and provide entirely for their own support. They pay for the privilege of working. Miss Bradford's headquarters for a time will be at the People's Palace, in Grand street, Jersey City. She may be addressed there, or at Upper Montclair, N. J.

**Forefathers' Day.**

The celebration of Forefathers' Day is getting to be very generally observed. It is not a holiday; but the indebtedness of the American people to the Pilgrim Fathers is so widely recognized that multitudes of others besides the direct descendants of the Pilgrims and members of the Pilgrim churches delight in doing honor to those who were the real fathers of the American Republic. In various parts of the country are New England Societies, which usually celebrate the day in a style very different from the way in which it was observed in the drear mid-Winter of 1620. The Congregational Clubs, which extend from one ocean to another, usually make their December meeting commemorative of the Pilgrim Fathers. In this way the children of the Pilgrims, and those who recognize their obligations to them, keep alive what, to all lovers of American institutions, must always be sacred memories. Among the programmes in the Congregational Clubs which have come before our observation, we notice those in Boston, where the chief address was given by the Rev. Dr. Behrends, of Brooklyn; in New York, where the speakers were Drs. Wright, of Buffalo, Barton, of Boston, and Mr. A. P. Wilder, of New York; in Omaha, where letters were read from representative men in various parts of the country; in Cleveland, where the addresses were by the Rev. D. O. Mears, D.D., of that city, and the Rev. A. H. Bradford, D.D., of Montclair, N. J. The Pilgrims have been often misrepresented; they were by no means ideal men; in many ways they were narrow and uncultured; but they were neither illiberal nor intolerant. The Plymouth colonists were far more tolerant than the colonists of Salem and Boston. When Roger Williams, was expelled from the Massachusetts Colony, he was welcomed at Plymouth, and it is well known that Captain Miles Standish was in sympathy with the Roman Catholics, if not a Roman Catholic himself. The Pilgrims stood for the right of each man to do his own thinking, for the sanctity of the reason and the conscience, even while they bowed most loyally to the authority of the Bible and to the sovereignty of God. They were the beginners of democracy in America, and they believed in de-

mocracy because they believed in the sovereignty of God and the brotherhood of man. The American people do well to keep in remembrance the teachings and the story of the Pilgrim Fathers. They belong to the heroic age of our history, and their legacy, both in the Church and State, may be condensed in the three phrases,—the sanctity of conscience, the right of each man to think for himself, and the only true State a democracy.

**The Children's Aid Society.**

No more valuable work in the cause of humanity is done by any church or any missionary society than that of the Children's Aid Society of New York. It is said that Children's Homes and Orphanages are almost unknown in Australia because the better plan has been adopted of finding permanent homes for the children of the cities in the country districts. This plan has been adopted by the Children's Aid Society, and not far from a hundred thousand have been taken from the streets of New York and distributed through all the States of the Union. The annual report of this society has just been presented. It will be remembered that for many years the executive head of this work was Charles Loring Brace, known on both sides of the sea both as an author and philanthropist, and his work has now been taken up by his son who bears his name. There is no better record of child-saving in any part of the world. We give below a few of the more prominent facts contained in this annual report:

The society now maintains twenty-one industrial schools, thirteen night schools and six lodging-houses in this city. Free reading rooms have been established at all the lodging-houses. The industrial schools have a marked effect on the neighborhood in which they are situated. The trustees, realizing the necessity of heroic work among the Polish, Bohemian and Russian immigrants, have, in the last year, established a new school in Rivington street. The school, which is known as the Lord Memorial, is at No. 173 Rivington street; the necessity of this school is shown by the fact that of the 350 children now enrolled nine-tenths never before attended any school. A great improvement is visible in the condition of the children of the new Sullivan Street Industrial School.

The evening classes are a valuable adjunct to the day schools. The object is to carry on, through the aid of paid and voluntary workers, evening classes, combining instruction and recreation for girls who have gone to work in shops or factories. These girls need a certain amount of recreation in the way of reading aloud, singing and general conversation, besides being taught sewing, cooking, etc.



The Emigrant Department continues to remove orphans and abandoned children from the debasing surroundings of slum-life to permanent homes in the West and South.

Through the generosity of Mrs. Joseph M. White a farm school at Kensico, in Westchester County, has been endowed, and to this the society looks as one solution of the boy-vagrant problem. The Brush Shop for Crippled Boys has also been successful in the last year.

In treating of the lodging-house feature the report says: "The five boys' lodging-houses and the Elizabeth Home for Girls have sheltered during the last year 6,277 homeless boys and girls, with a nightly average of 464. Comfortable beds and good meals are provided at a charge of six cents for a lodging and six cents for each meal. This charge accustoms the lads to self-support, and during the year brought in \$17,764 toward the maintenance of the houses. In the boys' savings banks were deposited during the year \$2,795.54. The superintendents assisted in starting in business or trades 271 boys, while employment in other ways was found for 648 others.

The Children's Home at Bath Beach and the Health Home at Coney Island, the latter for mothers with sick children, have been well-filled during the Summer season, and many a little life was saved by this grand branch of humanitarian work.

The society has received in the last year \$396,210.30, and after paying all expenses has a balance of \$365.07. Officers were re-elected as follows: D. Willis James, president; Charles E. Whitehead, vice-president; Charles Loring Brace, secretary; George S. Coe, treasurer.

#### A New Use For the Churches.

The Rev. B. Fay Mills has written an interesting letter concerning a new use (and why not a true use?) for our churches during this season of unexampled suffering from destitution. He says that while he was preaching in Chicago he noticed that six hundred men were sleeping over night on the stone floors in the corridors of the City Hall; that one of the janitors of the building had given them water, and that some of the men said that nothing else had passed their lips for twenty-four hours. This fact was mentioned at the service, when the pastors came together and provision was made for food to be taken to those who were spending the nights in the streets or the station houses. In the midst of the enthusiasm one pastor said, "Why not take some of these hundred and fifty thousand homeless people into our churches through the nights of this Winter?" The plan was taken into consideration, and it was proposed to improvise rooms in the different churches for this purpose. Mr. Mills says, "This plan seems to me easily practicable, in harmony with the spirit of

the Master, and well adapted to relieve untold misery in these coming months of poverty. One so well adapted to produce the beneficent effect of bringing together the prejudiced masses and the members of our churches, and destroying the well founded or unfounded prejudices against the churches on the part of the laboring man that I cannot but hope that the example of these earnest Chicago churches may be followed by scores and hundreds of others throughout the land." Mr. Mills has struck a true note. While we are asking how to reach the masses why not open the doors of our churches to them in the way of relieving their most immediate needs, and thus prove that we care for their souls by first caring for their bodies?

**Grace Parish, New York City.** The Year Book of Grace Parish, New York City, has just been placed in our hands, and we have perused it with intense interest. Many who are dependent on the sensational newspapers for their information think of Grace Church as a fashionable, unspiritual, society church, where the poor are never welcome, and where form and pretense have usurped the place which belongs to the simple teachings of the Christ. That nothing could be farther from the truth a brief study of this remarkable record of Christian work will show. To begin with, the doors of the church on Broadway, and we presume also of Grace Chapel, are open all day and every day, and all who wish may enter to rest and pray. In the next place the Rector of the Parish, Dr. W. R. Huntington, is a man of the broadest sympathies, the finest culture and the most consecrated spirit. No one can be with him for an hour without knowing that he is an intensely earnest and evangelical man. The church is the home of many of the oldest and wealthiest New York families, but they do not live for themselves alone, as this Year Book shows.

Let us observe a few of its more prominent facts. It is not a "one-man" parish, but has, including the Rector, five ordained ministers, giving their time to its various departments of Christian service. It has three Deaconesses and three other women-helpers, including one trained nurse. Its work is divided into twelve departments, not including the worship and preaching, viz.: "The Religious Instruction of the Young," "Missions at Home and Abroad," "Industrial Education," "Industrial Employment," "The Care of the Sick and the Needy," "The Care of Little Children," "The Visitation of Neighborhoods," "The Visitation of Prisoners," "The Promotion of Temperance," "Friendly Societies," "Libraries and Reading-rooms," and "Fresh Air Work."

These names indicate only departments, and in these various departments are many societies,

bands, guilds, etc., showing that there is little idleness in that Church. The extent of the work is also indicated by the Parish Buildings, eight in number, viz., Grace Church, the Rectory, Grace House, the Chantry, Grace Chapel, the Memorial House, Grace-House-by-the-Sea (at Far Rock-away), and Grace Mission House.

The Parish is about to erect a new Chapel in one of the neediest parts of New York, which will be a model of its kind. The plans for the building are already drawn, and much if not all of the money raised. The new buildings will embrace a Church, a Parish House for clubs, etc., a Clergy House, a Hospital, all built around an open court and connected by cloisters.

It would be impossible for us in the limits of a paragraph to do more than hint at what is being done in this venerable parish, but we have given facts enough to show that it is one of the busiest centers of Christian activity in the Metropolis, if not in the nation. The Rector, we presume, is a low church man, and possibly a broad churchman—if we do him injustice we beg his pardon—and he is certainly not only one of the most Christian, but one of the most statesman-like ministers in the Episcopal Church, and probably in the American Churches.

Rev. Charles W. Shields, D.D.

Prof. Shields, of Princeton College, is just now one of the prominent figures in religious circles in our country. For many years he has been known as a scholar and an author, eminent in historical and in philosophical studies; but within a year he has come into a position of leadership because of his remarkable paper on "The Organic Unity of Christendom." This paper we have referred to before, and we need at this time only say that, in our opinion, it is the most important contribution to the subject which has appeared in English during the past decade. As is well-known, Dr. Shields is a loyal Presbyterian, and a Princeton Presbyterian at that, although we presume there are many varieties of Presbyterians even in Princeton. The main contention of the paper is that the Historic Episcopate is essential to Catholic Church unity, and that without it such unity is impossible. As yet we are not able to give our assent to Dr. Shields' propositions, but we have never known them to be presented with such force, fairness and candor by any other writer.

But we started to give a pen-picture of the man rather than to repeat our synopsis of his paper. The new leader is apparently not far from sixty years of age, a man with most gracious and urbane bearing, modest and yet clear and strong in the presentation of his views. Everything about him denotes the scholar and the cultured

Christian gentleman. His heart is in the cause of Reunion, and he has been invited to read his now famous paper in probably nearly a dozen of our most prominent cities and ecclesiastical centers. More than any man of our time Dr. Shields has helped to make plausible the Historic Episcopate, and he always writes and speaks as a Presbyterian claiming that he can accept the Episcopate without ceasing to be a Presbyterian. His paper will soon be published, and will no doubt be widely read and exert a profound influence. If it seems to lean toward the Protestant Episcopal Church it is only in appearance, for he considers the Episcopate as an institution properly belonging to the whole Church of Christ, and quite as much in harmony with Congregational independency as with the more highly organized Episcopalian denomination.

#### Missionary Statistics.

We are indebted to a publication of the American Baptist Missionary Union for some statistics concerning the work of the various American Missionary Societies which are so important and so valuable that we present them here for the benefit of our readers. We presume that all know that the American Board is almost entirely controlled and supported by Congregationalists. The facts as presented in the *Missionary Handbook*, indicated above, are as follows:

Our evangelical societies are sustaining 724 principal stations and 4,742 organizations, with 1,272 men and 1,746 women as missionaries and 11,256 native helpers; connected with which are 2,603 churches, registering 295,326 communicants and 179,765 pupils under instruction. The number of communicants added to the churches during the year 1891-92 was 50,079. The contributions of the Churches of the United States amounted to \$4,983,561, while the mission Church gave \$803,351. Of the four principal societies, the American Board has (by the enumeration of 1892) 534 American missionaries, 2,600 native helpers and 434 churches, with 40,333 communicants; the Presbyterian Board, 596 American missionaries, 1,528 native helpers, 384 churches and 30,479 communicants; the society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 554 American missionaries, 2,637 native helpers, 366 churches and 57,273 communicants; and the American Baptist Missionary Union, 417 American missionaries, 1,553 native helpers, 76 churches and 100,931 communicants. Of pupils under instruction, the American Board has 47,330; the Presbyterian Board, 29,011; the Methodist Episcopal society, 41,071; and the Baptist Union, 22,284. The contributions to the American Board were \$840,804; to the Presbyterian Board, \$931,292; to Methodist Episcopal Missions, \$892,000; and

to Baptist Missions, \$569,172. The American Board reported 3,516 communicants added during the year; the Presbyterian Missions, 3,430; the Methodist Episcopal, 22,026; and the Baptist, 12,862. British missionary societies return, in the aggregate, 4,252 missionaries, 27,656 native helpers, 349,189 communicants and \$7,904,152 of income.

So far as we are acquainted with the societies mentioned above, they are devoted to foreign missions only. To them must be added the still larger figures which would be necessary to tell of the work done at home to get any adequate idea of what our American churches are doing for missions. It would be a noble aggregate.

*For Christian Literature.*

#### THE STUMBLING BLOCK AND THE HOPE OF CHRISTIAN UNITY.

BY REV. WM. CHAUNCY LANGDON, D.D.

The present is preeminently a period of questions and problems and movements. For every ill that society is heir to, there is, if not quite yet a remedy, at all events an earnest effort to discover one. There is scarce a social wrong but there are some who have taken it in hand to set it right. Never before was the amateur-reformer so generally recognized by his own contemporaries as having his proper place. The nineteenth century is setting its house in order, and reform and reconstruction are the watchwords of the welcome with which the coming of a new century is hailed.

In the very forefront of these problems to be solved and movements to be pressed forward is that of the restoration of organic Christian unity.

Our religious and ecclesiastical divisions are now rarely defended in principle. There are few to deny the folly, even if they extenuate the wickedness of our sectarian jealousies and rivalries. The Christian community has come to realize the fact that the causes and occasions of our denominational separations are, for the most part, wholly of the past; and that there are perhaps none of these which, if now arising for the first time, would have the disruptive power they once had. Whatever may have been the relation of our divisions to the conditions of other periods, it is now clearly seen that they are anachronisms of the most glaring character in our own.

Nor is this all. The demand for such restoration of Christian unity is imperative. On the one hand, it is pressed on the ground of *principle*,—on that of Christian consistency. The religious community is coming more and more deeply to feel the unreality of a Christian discipleship which sets aside the explicit commands of the Master and disallows His example, or which subordinates either to our inferences from the words of one or

another of His followers or even to our own personal preferences and prejudices. On the other hand, this insistence that the churches shall have done with their needless divisions and restore the unity of our Christianity is based upon the social and moral necessities of our times. On the ground that the living, practical, concentrated moral power of a reunited Christian Church can alone effectively solve the great social problems and deal with the sorer social wrongs from which the age is suffering, those in strenuous earnest about any of these are indignant at this enormous waste of money, of men, of opportunity, of influence and of moral energy. They are indignant at this Christless squandering of that spiritual power of which the Church is put in trust for the saving, not merely of its several individual members, but of society, for the healing of the nations.

Our religious divisions are, then, confessedly wrong in principle; no longer to be defended or even to be condoned on the ground of their original causes, the cause themselves of evils and wrongs innumerable, and in practice the most serious obstruction to the great moral reforms for which the world is waiting. All this has, in various tones and with ever increasing urgency, been pressed upon the Christian community for the last ten years. And yet, so general and so dominant has been the idea that ecclesiastical unity necessarily implies uniformity, and that all personal religious diversity normally involves organic division, that for a while few could conceive of such unity save as the result of bringing all Christians to agree in doctrinal opinions and to one type of the religious character. As this was itself utterly unattainable, so it was plainly seen to be most undesirable. Now, however, is has come to be realized that organic catholic unity—like organic unity in all nature, like the noblest harmonies in music and in art, and like the co-ordinated diversity of functions in the most perfect machinery, and in fact in all comprehensive organic energy—must be the unity of a perfectly correlated, while yet indefinitely varied diversity. To these convictions an ever increasing number of thoughtful men have been coming.

In the demand for such Christian unity some, at least, of the most scholarly and far-sighted leaders of thought in many religious communions are now at one. And certainly a widespread preparedness to encourage every effort to attain it, and to welcome it when attained, is now found among the Christian laity of almost every name. The great essentials of such catholic unity, as held by one great church, have been lovingly and solemnly submitted to the consideration of the Christian world, a commission of conference on the subject has been formally appointed and conference itself invited; while similar committees

have been appointed by two or three other churches. But here the movement seems to have been arrested. These committees have corresponded, and they have met. They have interchanged official as well as personal courtesies. Kind feelings and catholic yearning have been evoked; but not one governing ecclesiastical body has been able so much as to propose definite measures which would be at once possible and effective of the end in view. An honored and eminent Christian divine, looking calmly upon the practical results up to date, has declared that the *bubble has burst*.

The Christian Unity movement has indeed suffered an arrest. There are not a few, in consequence, to believe that the utmost has been said and done, that there is now nothing more which can be hopefully attempted, and that the sooner we all set ourselves to make the best of the actual conditions of divided Christendom, the better for us and for the world. A stumbling block in the way there certainly is. It is to be carefully considered what it is, and whether, if it may not for the present be removed, there may not be a way around it.

This stumbling block is found in the organic law of the several churches, with which the Christian Unity movement, at the first attempt to go from words to acts, from overtures to official measures, comes into conflict. For there is not one of the religious bodies into which our American Christendom is now divided which is not at present organized *as a sect*,—as a portion of the Church of Christ cut off—set apart to itself, either by its own choice, or by its former convictions of truth and right, or by its virtual acceptance of the generally current postulates of our American Christianity. Its organic law, or that which is at present virtually such, and the legislation and the ecclesiastical life, which result to it from that law, are in every case essentially sectarian. They are based upon the acceptance, the tacit, it may be the unconscious, but no less real acceptance of denominationalism as, if not normal, at all events permanent; and therefore no measures could probably be taken, practically effective of catholic inclusiveness, which would not be either directly unconstitutional or wholly out of harmony with that law. Catholic Christian unity must, therefore, in every case involve, if it must not even begin with, radical changes of a constitutional character.

It may be urged, and it will by some be replied that to this assertion there is at least one conspicuous exception—the Protestant Episcopal Church. Its representatives will very generally claim that this is *now* a catholic, an inclusive church, not a sectarian organization; and it was assuredly in that character and in the honest purpose to speak and act as such, that the overtures of the Bishops of that church were put forth a few years since.

But if this be an exception, it is also an illustration of the position which has been taken. The relations in which this church stands to this question are certainly, in some respects, exceptional; but they are at the same time anomalous and very little understood by the generality of even its own members. It is, strictly speaking, a dual body. The religious or church factor in its complex system is one thing; the ecclesiastico-secular structure upon which, after the analogy of the mother Established Church of England, that religious body is dependent for temporal support, with which it is closely interorganized, and by which it is, in many respects, controlled, and its catholic efficiency greatly circumscribed, is quite another. The *unwritten* constitution of the church part of this dual body,—as in England, so also here,—is, in the conviction of her faithful sons, thoroughly catholic in spirit and in principles; and that constitution finds its consistent expression in the Prayer Book, in the Creeds, in the Ordinal, and in an "Historic Episcopate" which they hold not merely to be derived "from the Apostles' time," but to be charged with a missionary trust to the future still before us.

The ecclesiastico-secular structure, which rests upon the local parishes and derives its authority upward from their several constituencies to the General Convention, has a *written* constitution. This constitution and the polity therein embodied were modelled avowedly, and without much consideration either of ecclesiastical precedents or of church principles, on the acceptance of the secular conditions which had been inherited from the colonial past and upon the civil institutions of the land. If to be constituted with reference to a portion only of the whole Christian community is to be sectarian, then this organization is, in its genius and in its practical working, as truly sectarian as any other ecclesiastical body of them all. These two, the religious body and the secular structure by whose organic law it is controlled, may indeed be quite distinguishable, as they very commonly are clearly distinguished in thought and feeling, and not only the unofficial language and action of the individual churchman, but at times even the formal utterances of official bodies may give no evidence of such restraints. It was in the name of this religious body that the Bishops spoke at Chicago; and it was without reference either to the English or to the American secular polity that the united Anglican Episcopate spoke at Lambeth. But in anything like official *action*, the American Episcopal Church cannot so ignore its organic or constitutional law. Neither is the General Convention which exists only by virtue of that constitution, nor, still less, a committee representing that convention, free to take a single official step, if inconsistent with that law, to give effect to the



language of the Bishops. Such a committee, if truly representing the strong irenic feeling of their co-religionists and their yearnings for Christian unity, must also represent their constitutional inability to act.

There is, then, practically no exception to the statement that not one of our leading ecclesiastical organizations, as they are now constituted, is free to advance *officially* in the direction of that Christian unity for which so very large a proportion of its members may severally be more than ready. It is true as well of the Protestant Episcopal as of all the churches, that nothing in her which is really catholic is inconsistent with organic Christian unity; but that everything which is inconsistent with that unity is essentially sectarian.

Moreover, not only is this organic law in every instance itself an insuperable obstacle to any present advance towards effective unity, but the only power which can modify this law, that is, the supreme ecclesiastical authority, is necessarily in the hands of those who are, for the most part, the older and therefore the more conservative representative products of the very principles embodied in such law, of which it is the outward expression and which must be at the least subordinated, if this movement is ever to go on from kindly words to effective official acts. Even this, when plainly seen to be necessary, will no doubt eventually be done; but they in whose hands rests this authority, would, as a class, be the last to realize that necessity; and it will be when the longed-for goal shall at last be full in sight even of these, that such constitutional changes will be effected, not as a means more clearly to reveal the way to it. An *official* committee, then acting or even speaking in the name of that constitutional authority, could fitly plan a reconstruction of Christian unity only upon the principles which are constitutionally recognized by that authority, upon some formula already accepted and for which the materials are now found in their ecclesiastical inheritance. But the materials for such glorious reconstruction will not be found certainly in the recent past; nor, such as that catholic unity must now be, wholly in any past. It is out of the future and from the treasures which that future will bring to us that it must be largely realized. And they who represent that future rather than the past, the undiscouraged pioneer and the irrepressible enthusiast, would not naturally find a place and certainly not an appropriate sphere of activity among those who, whatever their personal convictions or their faith, are necessarily restrained by the limitations of their official responsibility.

The stumbling block in the way of this movement is, therefore, the tacit assumption on almost every side that if Christian unity is to be attained at all, it both can and will be an *official* recon-

struction upon bases arrived at by *official* conference between *officially* representative bodies.

For a while, on the contrary, it is far more probable that official committees and General Conventions and General Assemblies have done their part. Certain of the larger ecclesiastical bodies have given the most distinct expression to the desire and longing of Christian people for Christian unity. They have set forth the great principles in accordance with which alone, in their godly judgment, it must be sought. Official committees have communicated those principles to each other. Under present circumstances they can do no more. Great discoveries in thought and great revelations in religious truth, as little as in the realms of geography and physics, are not made by official and responsible committees duly appointed by authority and formally charged with that duty; but by or through irresponsible enthusiasts who represent no one but, it may be, the Divine Spirit by whom alone they hold themselves impelled. Such discoveries are made by those who, although sometimes so fortunate as to inspire others with a portion of their own faith, quite as often go forth to their quest in utter loneliness, not because such duty has been authoritatively assigned to them, but simply and solely because, whether sustained or repudiated, they cannot do otherwise; and they are, as a rule, to be looked for only from these.

Let our ecclesiastical bodies continue, then, to prepare for the day which shall surely come. Let their official committees continue to watch and wait and to bear witness to the purpose of their waiting. But it is time *now* for our old men to see visions and for our young men to dream dreams; yes, iridescent dreams, if it please some so to regard them. For the effective formula of Christian reunion has yet to be discovered. The essential principles of Christianity itself and therefore of all genuine and stable catholic unity are to be sought—this indeed has been recognized—in the primitive Christian *past*. Yet none the less, the way to the recovery of that unity and the guiding principles of our return, or rather of our advance from the religious sectarianism of these days to such Christian unity, are to be sought in the *future*. It is by those only who can at once hold fast to those essential principles and look for their interpretation in the Christianity yet to come, that the longed for formula will be revealed to us who thus wait in perfect faith. And if our outlook be large enough we can scarcely doubt the issue, for the lines of intellectual and spiritual progress in every great division of our now distracted Christendom are all convergent.

It is for those, then, whose faces are turned trustingly to the future, whose faith in this fair future over the unexplored waters is irrepressible, to launch

forth together, if they will and whither they will, however blank their chart, and with no instructions save those of the faith that is in them, and freely to offer to the judgment of the Christian community whatever they may bring back therefrom. It will then, perhaps, be for younger men to act upon the results of such exploration and to put to proof their value, so only that both the one and the other shall do this on their own responsibility and unrestrained by the necessity of seeking for catholic unity in strict accordance with sectarian principles and of rebuilding that unity under the forms and with the machinery of a sectarian organic law.

In one at least of such visions certain things seem to be clearly defined, at all events to him who thinks he sees:—

1. That the propositions of the Episcopal Church have served to show that there is already substantial harmony, or at least a forbearing consensus, between the larger Christian churches in respect to the standards of doctrine and worship; that whatever differences yet remain in these respects may be safely put out of present consideration; and that it is only in respect to church polity and discipline that there even now remain any serious obstructions in the way of organic catholic unity.

2. That in this respect the factors of the unity so aimed at can be grouped, for all practical purposes, in three classes—those who give their allegiance, on principle, respectively to the Congregational, the Presbyterian and the Episcopal types of governance; and that it would seem antecedently probable that such reunion would be found, if at all, not in the direction of the triumphant maintenance of any one of these over the other two, but rather in some combination or correlation of the essentially characteristic principles of all three.

3. That the achievement of such a correlated unity will probably not be a deliberate construction or even a reconstruction formerly accomplished by official agencies; but rather a slow, quiet and gradual growth, from some germinal conception of such a unity, within the existing churches, containing in itself and in the smallest forms the living principles of that unity and in which is potentially involved all that may be looked or prayed for. In other words, as though the Church were represented in each one's conscience by his own thought and act and life,—organic Christian unity must begin with the responsive though irresponsible converging of individuals.

4. But that self-transference from one side to another of any of the dividing lines which now separate Christian communions,—whatever other reasons there may be for such a step in any case,—will contribute nothing towards the obliteration of those lines themselves. It is only so far as the individual is *and continues to be* a representative of a

given Christian organization or polity, that his action can contribute in the slightest degree to the end in view.

5. Still less would any action which virtually withdraws, not one, but many such individuals from their respective communions, to constitute a new ecclesiastical organization, be an advance towards such a unity. Even were the principles of the new organization themselves ideally catholic, this would leave their respective churches where they were before, for, from the hour of their withdrawal therefrom, their individual action would cease to have the slightest representative character.

6. That such individual action, to be an effective step in the direction of even future unity, must be taken as the proportionate part of a whole body—that whole body being transferred little by little, an individual *n*th part at a time, whatever may be the value of *n*—all moving in one direction. Then, only when the whole of any given ecclesiastical organization shall have thus become desectarianized, would the transference of that organization from its sectarianism to catholic unity be perfected. It will have been a growth, not a manufacture.

7. In such a gradual transformation of the present divided Christian bodies severally into the duly correlated integral parts of a catholic Church, while old men may well and wisely, if not, indeed, almost of necessity, be the theorists and counsellors,—none the less it will be from among the younger that the action will take its largest proportions, and its forceful significance. Unless the future ripen upon us with unexpected rapidity, the growth of such a catholic unity of the loyal members, as such, of the now divided churches, will have reached its full maturity only when the great mass of the Christians of the coming generation shall, in their turn, have become the elders of the Church of Christ.

When, therefore, there shall be found three groups of men, however few there be in each, all intelligently loyal to their own distinctive type of Christian polity, and thus far truly representative, and accepting in good faith, also, the limitations which, for the present, certainly, that loyalty imposes on them; men who, within those limitations, can and do unite in one common "communion and fellowship" for the expression of their Christian discipleship, by worship and labor for the Master; or, rather, when such men shall find each other,—three older men or more, if so it be, who, having realized for themselves, and so far as they were concerned, such a proportionate catholic unity, shall carry it to the younger men of our colleges, or elsewhere—then the restoration of such a unity, on however minute a scale, will have advanced from the region of words and theories to that of

action and of reality. And, if thus begun, it will grow until, in its growth, it will absorb the vitality of the sectarianism which now so powerfully holds us apart as distinct communions. It will grow until, in its maturing, the husk of that sectarianism will break and fall away from us on every side, leaving nothing but the ripe fruitage of a true, effective, and vigorous catholicity. And this, even under all the obstructions of the sectarianism of the day, is perfectly possible.

Such seems, at all events to one dreamer, the present hope of the restoration of Catholic Christian Unity.

### THE TEACHING OF OUR LORD AS TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY THE RIGHT REV. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.,  
BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

From *The Expository Times* (Edinburgh).

#### VIII.

#### OUR LORD'S REFERENCES TO HISTORY AND PROPHECY.

We now pass to the consideration of our Lord's teaching in regard of the historical and the prophetic Scriptures of the Old Testament, and to the inferences which may be drawn from His teaching as to the trustworthiness of the writers.

Before, however, we enter into the details of this teaching, it will be necessary to make a few preliminary comments.

1. We have now before us two classes of references; the one to certain facts and events to which our Lord makes brief allusions in His addresses to His disciples and to the Jews; the other, to prophecies relating to Himself and to His Messianic work. From the former of these no very conclusive inferences can be drawn. The historical references, or, to speak more correctly, the historical allusions are not in any respect of a critical nature. The twelve or thirteen separate incidents to which our Lord refers seem all specified with the simple view of defining, illustrating, or emphasising the subject-matter of the addresses in which they are found. They are not thus necessarily substantiated or authenticated by the fact that reference is made to them, but, as will be seen hereafter in detail, the manner in which the greater part are alluded to is such as to make it improbable that our Lord regarded them as otherwise than as veritable events of veritable and trustworthy history.

It is, however, otherwise with our Lord's references to prophecy. From almost all of these it will be seen that inferences may be drawn as to our Lord's recognition of the inspiration of the

writers and the reality of their predictions. It may be often doubtful whether the words of the prophecy admit of a primary reference, or whether we are justified in admitting a typical view of the words or incidents, and in believing that our Lord did the same. This, however, will not be doubtful,—that our Lord *did* regard the writers to whom He refers as inspired by God, and as speaking predictively. In fact, the words of the first evangelist, "spoken by the Lord through the prophet," represent the view which was entertained by the apostles, and also by our Lord Himself. This there seems no reason to doubt. It is, however, just what is doubted by some of the more advanced writers of the Analytical school. The authorship of the prophetic books has been for the most part left unchallenged. The dates also at which the different books were written have been in a few instances—as in the case of the Book of Daniel, and in the second portion of the Books of Isaiah and Zechariah—the subjects of vigorous controversy, but in the great majority of cases have not been seriously called in question. What has been called in question is the predictive element, whether in reference to national events, or to the Messianic dispensation. Writers like Professor Kuenen do not hesitate to regard the alleged predictions as simply fallible anticipations of the manner in which those who uttered them considered the Deity must, as a consequence of His character, according to their view of it, act towards nations and individuals. The traditional views of Messianic prophecy are freely recognised as forming a beautiful whole, but are gently set aside as having no historical reality to rely on. If appeal is made to the writers of the New Testament, and to their plainly expressed views of prophecy, we are distinctly told that their exegesis cannot stand before the tribunal of science; and if even a higher appeal is made, it is respectfully but firmly pronounced to be unavailing.

It is, however, right to say that such views have not as yet met with any reception at the hands of those who are supporting the Analytical view among ourselves. Still there are signs that increasing difficulty is being felt in regard of definite predictions, and that the anti-supernatural bias which is certainly to be recognised in the writings of the foreign exponents of the Analytical view is beginning, perhaps unconsciously, to be shown in this country by writers on Old Testament prophecy.

2. Another general remark that may be made on both the classes of references, the historical and the prophetic, which we are about to consider, is that, with regard to the space of time which they cover, both are distinctly comprehensive. The twelve or thirteen allusions to historical events in the Old Testament begin with Genesis

and end with the Second Book of Chronicles, and include allusions to events mentioned in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Samuel, and Kings. They may thus be considered as samples of our Lord's usual mode of referring to the Scriptures of the Old Testament in His discourses, whether to His disciples or to the Jews. They also seem to suggest that if more of our Lord's discourses had been recorded by the evangelists, we should have found in them similar allusions to the leading events in the history of the chosen people.

But be this as it may, a general view of the allusions which are recorded would seem to create the impression that the Lord regarded both the earlier and the later events as tradition has always regarded them, viz.: as real and historical, and as rightfully holding their place in the truthful annals of the nation. This further may be said, that not one of the references favors the supposition that any of the events might be mythical, or that any might have been rewritten by some priestly editor of adulterated history; on the contrary, the obvious simplicity and directness of them all seem unfavorable to any other supposition than that of the reality of the incidents to which they refer.

But this is but impression. If it is to be substantiated, it can only be so by a consideration of individual passages.

Much the same might be said of our Lord's references to prophecy. If we include therein both direct quotations and the more distinct allusions, we have more references to the prophetic than to the historical Scriptures; and if we add to them the references, direct and indirect, to the Psalms, fully twice as many. These references, too, as in the case of the historical references, range over some extent of time. Besides the Psalms, the Books of Isaiah, Hosea, Jonah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Zechariah, and Malachi are either cited from, or referred to, sometimes with, but more commonly without, specific mention of the names of the writers. So cogent also and so pertinent are these references, that even anti-predictive and anti-supernatural writers like Kuenen, though they by no means admit that our Lord's uses of prophecy are to be regarded as necessarily free from exegetical error, do draw clear distinctions between the references to prophecy made by our Lord and the references made by His Evangelists and Apostles, and do recognize to some extent the wisdom and knowledge with which the great Master made His citations from the prophets of the Old Covenant.

We do not, however, dwell upon such recognitions as these. What we now contend for is simply this—that, as in the case of the historical allusions, the impression conveyed was that our Lord considered the events referred to as real, so,

in these references to prophecy considered generally, the impression that seems left upon the mind is that the Lord recognizes in the prophets to whom He refers the gifts of inspiration and predictive knowledge, especially in their relation to Himself and His sufferings. This impression we must substantiate, and prove to be correct by considering in detail some of the citations or references which seem more distinctly to reveal the teaching of our Lord as to Old Testament prophecy. We begin, however, with our Lord's references to history, and will now endeavor to show, from some selected examples, that it is certain that He regarded the events as real, and that thus far He may be considered to set His seal to the truth of Old Testament history.

1. The first two examples which we propose to consider relate to that portion of the Book of Genesis which we are told by a recent writer is of the nature of myth, and "in which we cannot distinguish the historical germ, though we do not at all deny that it exists."<sup>1</sup> The two events are the death of Abel and the Flood.

Now, in regard to the first, what historical germ is there about which we can be in any difficulty? We learn from Genesis that the blood of Abel was shed by his brother, and that his blood cried unto God from the ground. To this event two evangelists tell us that our Lord referred in a rebukeful utterance, most probably in the hearing of the Scribes and Pharisees, in which He solemnly declares that all the righteous blood shed on the earth from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah will come upon those to whom these words were more particularly addressed. Now, when we turn to the narrative of the death of Zechariah, and mark his dying words, and the sort of analogy they suggest, with what is said of the blood of Abel, is it possible to doubt that our Lord was placing before those to whom He was speaking two historic circumstances and two historic persons? And are we not justified in saying this,—that the resolution of the history of the death of Abel into myth is out of harmony with the tenor of our Lord's words, and that we can only understand those words as implying that Abel was a person as really historical as Zechariah? If a serious speaker marks off a period of time by the names of two persons, one of whom is historical, is it natural to suppose that the other is mythical? It is certainly far from natural to suppose this in the case of the solemn and realistic words on which we have been commenting.

The reference to the Flood is mentioned by the same two evangelists, and in both with the addition of particulars not recorded in Genesis. The reference apparently forms part of a solemn address delivered by our Lord on the occasion of a

<sup>1</sup> *Lux Mundi*, p. 357.



question being put to Him by the Pharisees concerning the coming of the Kingdom of God.<sup>1</sup> In such a discourse we may feel confident that every word and every allusion must have its fullest significance. The details which our Lord drew from the treasury of His own divine knowledge could never have been added to the merely mythical or traditional. We are told, indeed, the contrary. It is said that our Lord suggests by these very additions that He is simply treating the Flood as typical,<sup>2</sup> and that we have here a tradition used as a vehicle for spiritual teaching. But is tradition rather than history what we should expect in such a discourse, and in reference to such a subject? Tradition, and embellished tradition, when the question was as to the coming of an event, solemn and real beyond all words—the coming of the kingdom of God? Does not the very principle of homogeneity require that there should be reality, historical reality in the illustration corresponding to the reality of that which it illustrates? Surely if an event alleged to have taken place in the past history of the world is placed before us by the Lord as typically foreshadowing the greatest and most certain event in the history of the future, it is but reasonable to suppose that the event so typically used was a real event, and was so regarded by our Master.

We may pass from these two events to another which, though not included in the so-called mythical period, has been often regarded as little better than legendary and traditional—the destruction of the cities of the plain, and the fate of Lot's wife. Here it is even less possible than in the case of the Flood to doubt that our Lord regarded the event as real, and as forming a truthful portion of truthful history. In His words describing the overthrow, He adopts the language of Genesis, and in the solemnly appended warning authenticates the account of the fate of the lingering woman who perished in the whirling storm, and whose memorial was one of those salt cones which the traveler still finds by the shores of the Dead Sea.<sup>3</sup> It is simply impossible to avoid the conclusion, that our Lord *does* confirm the historical truth of the narrative, and that, convenient as it may be found to push backward these illustrations of the supernatural into the region of legend, His use and application of the narrative distinctly forbids it. It may be quite true that the Lord, as a general rule, lays but little stress on the details of the account which He employs; still, in this case, it must not be forgotten that, in regard of the manner of the destruction of the cities, He adopts the very language of the original narrative.

The three remaining instances of references

made by our Lord to incidents mentioned in the Old Testament—all of them, it may be observed, miraculous—are the appearance of God to Moses in the burning bush, the descent of the manna, and the lifting up of the brazen serpent.

In the first of these three instances we have the concurrent testimony of three evangelists that our blessed Lord used the narrative to substantiate a doctrine of vital importance. The present case, then, is a case not merely of passing allusion, but of definite teaching; just one of those cases, in fact, in which we are justified in claiming that our Lord's words are to be considered as spoken with plenary authority, and as admitting no assumption of any accommodative use of the passage. They are spoken, too, with studied precision—"in the Book of Moses, in the place concerning the bush,"—and cannot possibly be understood in any other sense than as authenticating the narrative, and the miraculous circumstances related by Moses. We have, then, here an authoritative recognition not only of the narrative, but, by reasonable inference, of the inspiration and divine mission of Moses.

The second instance is of equal importance. The allusion to the manna is not merely incidental, but forms the typical substratum of the deep teaching in the synagogue of Capernaum of Himself as the living bread, the bread of which he that eateth will live forever. The allusion to the manna was first made by the Jews. The events of the preceding day and the feeding of the five thousand had turned their thoughts to the great miracle that was associated with His ministry, and they ask, it may be, that the Lord should prove Himself to be their long-looked-for Messiah by some analagous miracle which tradition taught them to look for in the Messiah. The answer is contained in all that follows, and in that answer the miracle of the first-given manna is not merely alluded to, but stated in the most definite and unreserved language. That the Lord Jesus Christ here places His seal upon a miracle which modern criticism regards as a story, that the Priestly Code has made use of for pressing upon the people the sanctity of the Sabbath, and has spoilt in the using, may be considered as beyond reasonable doubt.

In the third case the allusion is brief, but the circumstances under which it was made, and the deep teaching of the passage where it occurs, render it impossible to take any other view than that which recognizes in the words a reference to a real and historical event. According to the best interpretation of the passage, the verse which contains the reference sets forth a second reason and motive for belief in the Lord Jesus, prefacing it by an allusion to an event in the past that had a doubly typical character. The raising up of the

<sup>1</sup> See Meyer on Luke xvii. 26.

<sup>2</sup> *Lux Mundi*, p. 359 (ed. 10).

<sup>3</sup> See Lynch, *United States Expedition*, p. 143.

brazen serpent foreshadowed the Crucifixion; the healing power which flowed forth to him who gazed on the serpent betokened the saving power of faith in the crucified One. That the whole is only a legendary story, we are confident, will be pronounced by every fair mind utterly incompatible with the fact recorded by the evangelists,—that it was referred to by our Lord typically to set forth the doctrine of His own ever-blessed Atonement. A legendary story embellished by priestly ingenuity could never have formed the typical background for the Atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Of the remaining references, the most important are those in which our Lord alludes to Elijah's being sent to the widow of Zarephath, and to a miraculous event in the history of Elisha. The allusions were made in the synagogue at Nazareth, and in the address of our Lord which followed His public reading of Isaiah. The importance of the allusions is due to the fact, that the record of the ministries of Elijah and Elisha contains many accounts of miraculous events, in some of which even believers have felt passing difficulties, and all of which have been set aside, almost as a matter of course, by supporters of the Analytical view as utterly unhistorical. The narrative of the life of the first prophet is suffused with the miraculous; and in the case of the second prophet, not only during his life, but even after his death the miraculous clings to him. It is thus of no little moment that our Lord, in His public teaching, referred to events in the life of each of the two prophets in a manner which seems to indicate that He accepted and confirmed by His authority, at the very least in the instances alluded to, the truth of the scriptural narrative. Such an attestation of a narrative, in parts of which real difficulties have been felt, must cause, in all sober minds, an immediate arrest of judgment. It may not always in itself at once convince, but it never fails to prepare the way for considerations which often bring about a conviction more real and more lasting than is brought about by more direct and more elaborate argument. The simple feeling that He thus believed will often be found to remove almost at once many a speculative difficulty.

Lastly, it is worthy of especial notice that just those miraculous events which seem more particularly to put our faith to trial—such, for example, as those connected with the histories of Elijah and Elisha, or with the early history of Genesis—are the events to which, it would seem, our Lord has been pleased more particularly to allude.

2. We may now pass onwards to our Lord's references to prophecy; but before we consider passages which clearly belong to this portion of the subject, it may be well first to notice a well-known and anxiously-discussed passage, in which the

question turns not so much on the prophecy as on the credibility of the events connected with it. I am alluding, of course, to the passages relating to the Book of Jonah and to the prophet's mission to Nineveh. Careful interpretation will here do something for us.

When we refer to the Gospels, we find that our blessed Lord twice alluded to Jonah, once after the healing of a demoniac, and once, very briefly, a little later; and in both cases in answer to a demand from the Jewish party for a sign. It is only with the words spoken on the first occasion that we are particularly concerned. These are given fully, and, as it would seem, in their original form by St. Matthew. The report of the words in St. Luke's Gospel is more condensed. In both of these passages, however, it is clear that the prophet, and not His preaching, is the sign and the type. His preaching and its results are mentioned, but quite independently, being designed simply to put in contrast the acceptance of the message of Jonah on the part of the Ninevites, and the rejection of the message of One greater than Jonah by the Jews.

How the prophet is a sign is very distinctly mentioned by St. Matthew: "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." With the details and the decision of the question whether "the heart of the earth" refers to the sepulchre or to Hades, we need not here concern ourselves. The "three days and three nights" of the Lord's being in the heart of the earth requires in either case the same explanation. And the common explanation seems to be the right one,—that "the three days and three nights" in reference to our Lord are used, not with any studied precision, but simply in echo of the words in the Book of Jonah, and as popularly designating the whole day and parts of two other days, which was the exact period in the case of our Lord, and, for aught we know, may have been so too in the case of Jonah. Thus considered, the time is typical; the belly of the fish is typical; the deliverance of Jonah is typical. And of what? Of the resurrection and of what preceded it. On this we may fairly ask this further question, If the history of Jonah is not only a fiction, but, as a responsible writer has said, a story bearing marks of it as patently as any of the tales in the Thousand and One Nights,<sup>1</sup>—if the circumstances are not only improbable, but grotesquely so, is it conceivable that such a story would be used by our Lord as a type of His resurrection? Is an unreal narrative,—a narrative which, if interpreted historically, "justly gives offence,"<sup>2</sup> to be re-

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Cheyne, in an article in the *Theological Review* for 1877, p. 212.

<sup>2</sup> Kuenen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 214.

garded as typical of the great and real miracle which is the foundation of Christianity? In a word, is any other view fairly compatible with the nature of the comparison than that our Lord regarded the Jonah sign as a reality, and the particular deliverance of Jonah as a fact? and if He did so, further critical inquiry is foreclosed. The Jonah miracle may seem amazing, but still more amazing, if we consider it in detail, is the resurrection from the dead. Our conclusion, then, is that our Lord was here referring to an historical event, though we have no power of supplying anything, whether from contemporary history or otherwise, which might seem to make the event more readily conceivable to those who have made up their minds to disbelieve it.

We now pass to a few selected instances of our Lord's references to definite prophecy, and more particularly to those that related to Himself.

It is, however, difficult to make a selection, as all our Lord's references to prophecy really convey, almost equally strongly, the same impression, viz., that our Lord distinctly recognised the inspiration of the prophets of the Old Testament, and the predictive contents of their writings, and especially their pervasive references to Himself, His work, His sufferings, His death and His exaltation. How He regarded the prophets collectively as speaking of these things, we are thrice reminded by St. Luke,—once, before His sufferings, with a detail that brings to the memory the express words of the great prophecies in the latter portion of Isaiah; once, after His resurrection, when he vouchsafed to interpret to the two disciples at Emmaus, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets," the things foretold in all the Scriptures concerning Himself; and yet a third time, even more solemnly,—as it was probably immediately before the Ascension,—when, as the evangelist studiously records, He opened the mind of the apostles, that they might understand the Scriptures, and particularly those relating to His sufferings and resurrection, so that thus we may rightly say that, in the Lord's last address on earth, the collective testimony of the prophets and of all Scripture formed the subject of His parting and verifying words.

And so it was during the Lord's whole ministry. His references and allusions to prophecy were very numerous. Twice He refers to those words of Hosea which characterised all the tenor of His ministry. Twice He cites Isaiah by name; once in reference to the dullness of heart of the nation to whom he had vouchsafed to come,<sup>1</sup> and again, when rebuking the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees, and showing that their very worship was vain in the eyes of God. When He speaks of the Baptist He refers to

Malachi, and discloses the true and ultimate meaning of the prophet's words, introducing in them, as he does so, a change which makes the prophet the very mouthpiece of the Eternal Father. When he purges the temple, in the few words in which He vouchsafes to give the reason for the act, He refers to two of the old prophets. In His last great prophecy He alludes by name to that one of the old prophets,—I am referring to the prophet Daniel,—to whom modern criticism more particularly denies the name of a prophet, and even of a trustworthy historian;<sup>1</sup> and when He stands before the High Priest and the Sanhedrim, He adopts words from the same prophet which all present at once recognises and—with perhaps two solitary exceptions<sup>2</sup>—wildly act upon.

It is, however, as we have already implied, when His sufferings and death are nigh at hand, that the Lord's references to prophecy became more distinct and emphatic. There are two occasions on which our Lord cites definitely prophetic words under circumstances which preclude the possibility of any other supposition than that He knew them to have a Messianic reference, and cited them accordingly. The first occasion is immediately after the celebration of the Last Supper, when the dispersion of the apostles was foretold. Here our Lord, significantly changing the imperative to the future,<sup>3</sup> uses words from Zechariah which, from the manner in which they were introduced ("it hath been written"), cannot be regarded as semi-proverbial, but as a definite reference to prophecy. On the second occasion, under the same solemn circumstances, our Lord quotes words from the great Messianic prophecy of Isaiah, which He not only applies directly to Himself, but enhances by the further declaration that they *must* be fulfilled in Him, and that "that which concerneth" Him,—that which the prophet had foreshadowed, and He Himself had recently foretold, its having its fore-ordered issue and fulfillment.

This statement of the divine necessity that prophecy *must* be fulfilled in Himself, is in truth one of the strongest arguments in favor of the Traditional view of prophecy, especially in its relation to our Lord, that can be adduced. It is a direct testimony, on the part of our Lord, of the truth and reality of the Messianic prophecy of the old covenant. It is a testimony that was, at least three times, explicitly given;—once in the passage we have already considered; once at the betrayal at the garden of Gethsemane; and once again, after the resurrection, in even more comprehensive language, when, in the last address on

<sup>1</sup> Kuonen, *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*, p. 147.

<sup>2</sup> Joseph of Arimathea (Luke xxiii. 50, 51), and probably Nicodemus; cf. John vii. 50.

<sup>3</sup> See Turpie, *Old Testament in the New*, p. 152 (London, 1868.)

<sup>1</sup> Turpie, *Old Testament in the New*, pp. 88 sq.



Olivet, the ascending Lord set His final seal on Messianic prophecy in the great authenticating declaration "that all things *must needs* be fulfilled which are written in the Law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms concerning Me." Nay, we may add to this, if we take what seems to be the natural connection of the passage; we may reverently say that even on the Lord's cross of suffering the fulfilment of prophecy was the subject of His divine thoughts. The words "I thirst" were spoken that Scripture might be fulfilled. And when the words of the prophetic psalm were substantiated to the very letter, then all things were indeed accomplished;<sup>1</sup> and with the words of the old Psalmist on His lips, He who came to fulfil prophecy, and fulfilled it in all His blessed ministry, fulfilled it with His dying breath.

Only one reference remains to be noticed. It is different in character to all that have been alluded to; and it seems to show that, in one instance at least, our Lord did pronounce a judgment on prophetic Scripture which, when carefully considered, must be regarded as having a very far-reaching significance. The reference is to Ps. CX. (Sept. CIX.),—a reference given in substantially the same form by the first three evangelists. What we may deduce from this passage is this: First, that the psalm was written by David, and that thus this particular superscription is right. Secondly, that David was here writing by direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Thirdly, that the reference to the Messiah is so distinct, that David may be regarded as consciously speaking of Him.<sup>2</sup> All this seems patently to be deducible from what Professor Ladd justly calls this "decisive utterance."<sup>3</sup> It is perfectly true that we can draw no inference from this particular case as to the Davidic authorship of other psalms, or as to the nature of the inspiration of David in other psalms which we may believe to have been rightly ascribed to him; still the passage stands as a kind of beacon light, displaying to us what, in one instance at least, was the judgment of the Lord Jesus Christ in reference to Messianic prophecy. Surely with the rays of such a light upon us, we may accept the words of an apostle, and believe that neither this nor any other prophecy ever came by the will of man, but that "men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." The attempts on the part of modern criticism to explain away the impression which this memorable passage will not fail to leave on any candid mind, are many, but all singularly hopeless. It may be perfectly true that our Lord is asking a ques-

tion rather than making a statement;<sup>1</sup> but if the question is of such a nature that it plainly involves and implies the recognition on our Lord's part of certain facts and truths, why are these facts and truths not to be put in evidence as recognized by Him, and as having the seal of His authority? The true answer to this is because it is inconvenient to modern criticism, which has settled that the psalm is of a very late date and has no Messianic reference at all.

But is not modern criticism utterly wrong? Let us put this to the test by this simple question—Is it to be regarded as probable that, if the psalm had really been of this late date, there was no one in the gathered company of Pharisees to whom the words were addressed who knew that it was so? If this was *not* probable, then why did not some one of these experts at once traverse the Lord's question by the easily made statement that David never wrote what was imputed to him? If, on the other hand, it *was* probable, then can we possibly believe that a metrical fabrication claiming to be a psalm of David and an oracle of God, and challenging attention by setting forth a doctrine so unfamiliar as the Messiah's everlasting priesthood,<sup>2</sup> could have crept into the jealously guarded Scripture, three or four centuries after the date of Ezra's Bible, and remained there undetected? Whatever else may be said of the Scribes, they were certainly careful and jealous guardians of the very letter of the Scriptures.

We are thus, apart from other considerations, forced by common sense to believe that the psalm *was* Davidic, and was known to be so by our Lord and those to whom He was speaking. And we are confirmed in this by what followed. The question produced a startling effect. It raised, on the authority of David, the question of the Divinity of the Son of David; and we read, as we might expect to read, that no man "durst from that day forth ask Him any more questions."

We have now concluded our examination of our Lord's references to history and to prophecy, and the results at which we have arrived would seem to be as follows:

First, that the impressions conveyed by a general survey of the references to history and to prophecy appear to be substantiated in each case by the more detailed examination. This examination has, we believe, been carried out with fairness and impartiality, and with due regard to recognized principles of scriptural interpretation. The conclusions to which it leads are, certainly, that the historical references were to real events, and to acknowledged facts in history; and that the prophetic references imply throughout a clear recog-

<sup>1</sup> Observe the carefully chosen word *τελευτῶν*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Delitzsch, *in loc.*

<sup>3</sup> *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 63.

<sup>1</sup> *Lux Mundi*, p. 359.

<sup>2</sup> See Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament*, § 230, vol. ii., p. 413 (transl.), Edinburgh, 1875.



nition on the part of our blessed Lord of the inspiration of the prophets He referred to, of the reality of their predictive knowledge, and of the distinctness of their Messianic foreshadowings and prophecies.

It is with these conclusions that we are here more particularly concerned; because if they are correct, they do distinctly negative, not merely several of the results of the Analytical view and of the conclusions at which its advocates have arrived, but even some of the ground-principles of modern criticism. This is very plainly felt by the supporters of that movement, and may account for the earnestness and even bitterness with which any reference to Christ is deprecated in matters alleged to belong exclusively to the domain of critical inquiry. We have touched upon this in a foregoing paper, but we may again ask, Why are we to be precluded from this reference to the Great Teacher? Had He not the words of eternal life? Did He not come into the world to bear witness to the truth? If He is the Light of the world, the true Light that lighteth every man, are we to dispense with that Light in a domain where it is more particularly needed? We have seen in this article the blessed nature of the guidance we receive in regard to God's Holy Word when we turn to Him,—the freshness, the freedom, the life that breathes through His teaching of that Word; how events and facts seem quickened with a new life when He alludes to them, and how the sure word of prophecy is made more sure to us when He is the interpreter. The more we enter into detail the more vividly is all this impressed upon us.

We conclude, then, this article with the hope, and indeed the belief, not only that we have substantiated that which we have sought to substantiate—not only that we have shown that many of the results of modern criticism in reference to God's Holy Word are inconsistent with the teaching of Christ, but that we have also incidentally demonstrated the rightfulness of the appeal to *Christus comprobator*.

## CHRISTIANITY AND ROMAN PAGANISM<sup>1</sup>

### II

BY PROF. ST. GEORGE MIVART.

From *The Nineteenth Century* (London), November, 1893.

With such notions intolerance and a spirit of proselytism were incompatible. When a Roman travelled he was careful to adore local deities, without a thought of being thereby unfaithful to his own most powerful gods, who had made Rome the capital of the world.

This disposition of mind greatly facilitated conquest, since no religious rancour hindered the

fusion of a new province with the rest of Rome's vast domain. Tolerance was further promoted by that tendency of philosophy (before mentioned) to consider the several worships of various deities as but so many different modes of adoring the same god—as the divine influence on the earth might be adored as *Ceres*, that of the sea as *Neptune*, and that of the heavens as *Jupiter*.

We have seen how laic was the spirit of Roman religion. But most, if not all, the religions from the East assigned a much more important and mystical position to their priesthoods. Thus when a man desired to be initiated into the mysteries of Isis a priest served as his spiritual father, and had a claim for life on the gratitude of his spiritual son. Such priests were by no means contented with directing the externals of worship; they desired to "save souls," and to this end did what was altogether new at Rome, actually preached sermons! Thus Apuleius represents a priest, after a miracle in the temple of Isis, declaiming against unbelievers as follows: "Let them approach, let them come and examine for themselves, and then confess their error." Then turning to the subject of such miraculous favour he is said to have exclaimed, "If thou wouldst dwell in security, inaccessible to the blows of fortune, enroll thyself in the Holy Militia; come voluntarily and bow thy head under the yoke of the sacred ministry. It is only when thou shalt be the slave of the goddess that thou wilt begin to experience what perfect freedom is."

Such priests devoted themselves exclusively to their sacred calling, glorying in detachment from the world and ordinary human affections, with definite rules of life, and wearing a distinctive habit.

Eastern religions became more and more influential with the Antonines, and attained a triumphal position under Severus. Processions wended their way through the streets of Rome, sometimes of black-robed priests of Bellona, tearing their flesh and dancing like modern dervishes; sometimes of priests of Isis in snow-white linen robes and with tonsured heads.

One great advantage pertained to these Eastern religions—namely the pardons they could grant in return for ceremonial observances. Gladly did trembling sinners practise fastings, offer sacrifices, and scatter their wealth profusely, in order thereby effectually to disarm divine justice.

There were priestly brotherhoods in Egypt, which inhabited temples, and, rejecting all active employment, consecrated their lives to worship and devout contemplation. Their movements were grave and measured; they kept their hands folded within their mantles, and slept on palm leaves, with a block of wood for a pillow, abstaining from wine and various kinds of food.

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted by permission of the Leonard Scott Publication Company.

Such a monastic institution existed at Memphis, the strictly enclosed members of which called themselves "servants of Serapis." There were pagan anchorites in Egypt who, 150 years before Christ, anticipated the Christian recluses of the Thebaid. Such institutions evidently accorded with the genius of the nation.

Similarly in Syria pilgrims came by thousands not only to adore the famed goddess Astarte, but also to assist at the functions performed by her priests.

Twice a year one of them ascended to the summit of an enormous phallus, where he remained seven days and nights without sleeping, making intercession for the devotees, who deposited their offerings at the base of the structure on which he thus dwelt—strange anticipation, as far as externals went, of the peculiar devotional practices of St. Simeon Stylites and the other pillar saints of Syria!

In the Eastern religions, however details might vary, the special subject of religious excitement was generally a legend of the death and resurrection of some god—as Osiris, mourned by Isis; Adonis, by Astarte; or the great mother seeing the beauteous Athis expire in her arms. To mourning, plaintive or tumultuous, succeeded explosions of joy on all sides, with groans and tears, when at length were heard the mystic words, "He is regained; let us rejoice!"

It was especially in Egypt that exciting public worship took place within the temples, such as long had no place in those of Rome. But the Eastern influence extended by degrees even to the very worship of Jupiter at the Capitol. His temple was solemnly opened for his "awakening," and as soon as the entering crowd perceived his image in the distance they cried out, "*Salve, imperator!*" All day long devotees performed, or pretended to perform, services of the most varied kinds to the greatest and best of gods. There were women who even flattered themselves that they could gain his love, and who would pass whole days seated beneath his statue without any fear of Juno's anger.

But while foreign religions had thus their effect on that of Rome, the latter reacted upon them by promoting calmness and sobriety with exactness of ritual observance. Thus with the great fusion of races which the Empire brought about, its tolerant, non-proselytising spirit also brought about a vast religious fusion. So it was that a sort of pagan Catholic Church spread and diffused itself throughout the civilised world. It can, however, only by courtesy be called a "Church," since it had no common dogmas, no universal discipline, no means (nor any desire) of enforcing conformity and obedience to a supreme religious authority.

Still it constituted a sort of religious *pax romana*; it broadened the road of Christianity, and especially prepared the way for its effective organisation.

As Rome became a residence for all strange gods, it also became both the religious capital of the world and its religious centre. It became, and was called, the "Holy City" and the "Eternal City"; and so, when Christianity ultimately triumphed, it still retained those titles, and became naturally, as well as for other reasons, regarded as the religious capital of the Christian world.

Only two religions were excluded from the otherwise almost universal toleration of paganism—namely, Judaism and Christianity. Fathers of the Church have complained of this, yet somewhat unreasonably; for the concord which existed between the various pagan forms resulted from their willingness to make reciprocal concessions. This neither Jews nor Christians would, nor could, consent to; and they had naturally to take the consequences. Yet peace was offered to them on the same conditions as to others. The pagans were ready to recognise in Jehovah their own Jupiter or Bacchus, and not a few were willing to keep the Sabbath and observe Jewish fasts and feasts. There were also some Jews, like Herod, who would not have regretted such mutual understandings; but the mass of the nation repelled them with horror, and thereby incurred bloody persecutions, wherein thousands lost their lives, and furious hatred against them arose, which only ceased when they associated themselves with the pagans to persecute Christianity.

The Christians, as every one knows, were also offered what were deemed favourable terms, and little difficulty would have been felt in the acceptance of Christ as one god more, and (as readers will remember) his image had its place in the private chapel of the Emperor Alexander Severus, beside those of Orpheus and Apollonius. But no consistent Christian could tolerate idolatry even to the extent of scattering a few grains of incense on the altars either of the Goddess of Rome or of the Genius of the Emperor. Such a spirit of exclusiveness was a new thing to the pagans and naturally appeared disloyal to the Romans and opposed to the very essence of "civicism."

The limited space at my disposal compels me to pass over much I would fain say as to Roman paganism, and to proceed at once, from this brief record of facts, to sum up those of its characters which most opposed, or directly or indirectly aided, the Christian system.

(1) It was the identification of the Roman religion with the State which was, perhaps, the most powerful of all hostile influences, while closely connected therewith was the lay spirit of its various priesthoods. Since no character which was

baneful to the progress of Christianity could possibly have pertained to its essence, the identification of temporal with spiritual ends and aims could not be an essential character of Christianity, but must be more or less completely opposed thereto.

Later on (as we have seen) the Eastern religions introduced another spirit, and one more in harmony with the growing religious needs of the pagans of the first two centuries. This change, however, instead of favouring Christianity, indirectly impeded it. It did so inasmuch as it occasioned a rejuvenescence of paganism, and enabled it (by imperfectly ministering to those growing religious needs which only Christianity could completely satisfy) to prolong its life by acting as a rival to the Christian system.

(2) The non-moral nature of paganism generally must have gained it the support of those least disposed to conform to ethical requirements, and so aided the direct opposition to Christianity; while the moral amelioration introduced by philosophy, like the just mentioned religious rejuvenescence, must have indirectly opposed it by the more successful rivalry thus occasioned. That morality is of the very essence of Christianity is a fact which no one will probably for one moment question.

(3) That Roman religion consisted merely of ceremonial observances, and was devoid of dogma on the whole, greatly facilitated (as we have seen) its general acceptance and maintenance, and so far was one great barrier against Christian progress. Such a character of mere formality and such repugnance to dogma could not, therefore, pertain to the essence of Christianity.

(4) The growth of and tendency towards monotheism, imperfect as it was,<sup>1</sup> cannot have acted as a hostile influence, save in so far as it may have lent some strength to pagan rivalry.

(5) The existence of slavery on the one hand, and the improved condition of the female sex on the other, had doubtless effects, both direct and indirect, of an unfavourable character; but we do not see evidence that they necessarily predominated over other of their effects which were favourable.

We will now pass on to enumerate characters which appear to us to have, directly or indirectly, helped the reception and progress of the Christian Church.

(1) And in the first place the whole upward religious movement, which, after its initiation by Augustus, continued to advance during the first

two centuries, served as a most important, if not absolutely indispensable, direct auxiliary.

(2) That state of mental expectation (before referred to in connection with Virgil) must have disposed many a mind to accept the Christian revelation.

(3) The fact that paganism, in spite of all the efforts of philosophy, could not succeed in purging its religion of immorality, was one of the most powerful of the causes which induced its overthrow. Besides sexual impurities, human sacrifices, in spite of all laws, from time to time recurred, and the beauty and fashion of Rome would make a gay excursion to behold a newly installed priest of that priesthood composed exclusively of murderers which Renan has so graphically depicted.

(4) The formal and undogmatic characters of Roman religion, though (as we have just seen) they had these adverse influences, none the less greatly aided the Christian advance; for there were multitudes of men and women who craved for more definite religious knowledge and far more hearty and spiritual worship.

To such the various "mysteries" and Eastern religions afforded some solace, but M. Boissier gives us evidence that they were far from satisfying the cravings felt. Nothing was perhaps more difficult for paganism than the formulation of dogmas, except the formation of, say, a general and complete authoritative system. The latter, indeed, may be said to have been absolutely impossible to it. There were many who desired a religious yoke, but none—Jews and Christians apart—who could consistently impose it. Besides this defect, philosophy made no sufficient efforts to enlighten and instruct the people, and great was the contrast, in this respect, between both pagan priests and philosophers, and the early preachers of the Gospel. These deficiencies in worship, dogma, and instruction gave great indirect aid to the progress of Christianity.

(5) The imperfection (already noted) of the attempts made to attain to monotheism must also have indirectly, by contrast and defect, served to help on the Christian cause.

(6) The increased power and influence of the devout sex was of immense benefit to the nascent Church, which was also largely recruited by the servile class, whose very desirabilities tended to make them seek its comfort and moral support.

(7) One of the most powerful impulses towards the Christian religion seems to have been due to that combined anxiety and uncertainty about a future life which was so prevalent in the Roman world. Without dogma believed to be certain, because reposing upon an infallible revelation, no adequate consolation for the trials and afflictions of this life can possibly be offered.

Such, if we are not greatly mistaken, were the

<sup>1</sup> Thus the devotees of various gods often regarded their particular god as the only one, for which all the others were but different names or different aspects. This was especially the case with Jupiter and Isis, and also with Cybele, and Mithra—who was ultimately so widely adored. But the assertion that a given god was God *par excellence*, was very different from a dogmatic assertion of the essential unity of the Divine Nature.

main influences which opposed or favored the advance of Christianity. It only remains for us to note certain contrasts between the last-named religion and the system it found existing in the world, in order to be able to determine one or two characteristics which we think must be admitted to pertain to the essence of Christianity.

That great, non-contentious, incoherent religious mass which, by a somewhat forced comparison, we have termed the "pagan Church" was entirely devoid of a definite, universally received system of belief the same for the cultured and the ignorant, without any distinction of esoteric and exoteric views. Even that which seemed the most stable and definite system of thought—that of the Stoics—was such only in appearance. The Stoics were agreed neither as to the immortality of the soul nor as to the nature of God, who was for some the sun, for others the ether, and for yet others nothing but the material world itself.

Philosophy had proposed and attempted to answer the most important problems, but had left them unresolved. The religious revival had excited pious desires and aspirations without affording them any solid satisfaction. The Emperor was Pontifex Maximus, and worshipped while alive as well as after death. Yet, though Roman religion was identified with him, he was as impotent as undesirous to settle any fundamental beliefs for his people's hearty and conscientious acceptance, though, of course, he could enforce external ceremonial. There was universal toleration precisely because there was a universal impotence for establishing any certain and dogmatic truth. The toleration of such a Church was but negative, and consisted in the non-insistence universally of beliefs which were locally deemed of most vital importance. Its catholicity was similarly spurious and negative, and depended on the non-universal acceptance of what were locally regarded as the most sacred of religious truths.

Contrasting with this nebulous religious system the nascent Christian Church; two of its characteristics stand out in the most striking contrast. They are (1) an organic catholicity, and (2) authoritative dogmatism—not only as to outward acts but also as to complete internal assent and belief. As to its catholicity, the same fundamental doctrines—however small their number compared with the explicit possessions of later ages—were everywhere taught and received. Neither was there any distinction of esoteric and exoteric teaching. The Church either of Rome, Jerusalem, Egypt, or transalpine Gaul did not admit to communion members of any other local Church which denied the doctrines (whether of Rome, Jerusalem, Egypt, or Gaul) held to be the most sacred of all. It was a real catholicity, inas-

much as it depended on the universal acceptance of what was most revered in each and every province of the empire. It was catholic also, because it had no limit as to nationality, and was the offspring of no local cultus in any city, while it was freely offered to the citizens of every city, to the inhabitants of every province of the Empire, and to the world beyond the Empire. No competent scholar denies that at the close of the second century such a catholic Church gives evidence of at least its incipient existence.

This character of "catholicity" can hardly be denied to be one pertaining to the essence of the Christian Church long before it mounted the throne with Constantine.

But its catholicity depended on another character still more essential and fundamental, and yet more contrasted with the nature of the so-called pagan church.

This still more fundamental character was that of authoritative dogmatism. To all men a doctrine was preached, and assent to its teaching was categorically demanded. No external acts, no ceremonial observances, were deemed of the slightest value without the interior assent of the mind and the adhesion of the will to that doctrine. Moreover, the Christian religion did not consist of religious doctrines or of religious practices, but of two facts, the acceptance of which, as facts, was indispensable and imperative: (1) one of them was the fact of the founder's life, death, and resurrection; the other (2) was the fact of an organized community which authoritatively handed down and interpreted the tradition of that founder's teaching, with power to add to or exclude from the Christian body, although membership of that body was taught to be a necessary condition of life everlasting.

Quite recently it has been shown, by an authority who cannot be accused of any ultra-orthodox tendency, how authoritative and distinctly dogmatic was the early Church, and how great was the influence of the authority of Christian Rome. Dr. Adolph Harnack<sup>1</sup> has given the early creed of the Roman Church as follows:

I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ His only begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, crucified and buried under Pontius Pilate, who rose on the third day from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead; and in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Church, the forgiveness of sins, and the resurrection of the flesh.

This Roman confession Dr. Harnack regards<sup>2</sup> as having been "in all cases the foundation stone whence the various provincial Churches satisfied their several needs according to their different

<sup>1</sup> See *Nineteenth Century* for July, 1893, p. 158.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 162.



circumstances. He roundly declares that "the creed of the city of Rome governed the whole creed-formation of the West;" and he further tells us<sup>1</sup> that "the various anti-Gnostic rules of faith presuppose a short, settled, formulated creed, and this must, in the second century, have been the old Roman creed."

As to the precise period at which its existence must be admitted—the minimum of its antiquity—he regards it<sup>2</sup> as certainly dating from "the middle of the second century," and affirms that it can be traced "*on direct lines*" to the second half of the third. But no one will probably dispute that if such a creed was a recognised authoritative baptismal symbol as early as 250 A.D., it is impossible to believe that it could have grown up in fifty years; and thus it plainly comes within the range of the period considered in this article—namely, the two first centuries of our era.

But as to the character of the early Roman Church and our indebtedness thereto, Dr. Harnack says—

Whoever turns from the perusal of the Apostolic Fathers and the Christian apologists to the Old Roman confession cannot but render a meed of grateful admiration to the Roman Church for the act of faith which she has here made in her baptismal creed. If we consider with what strange and curious notions the Gospel was already at this time often associated, in what a meagre spirit it was often conceived, and how Chiliasm and Apocalypics on the one hand, and legalism and Greek philosophy on the other threatened to destroy the simplicity of Christ, the Old Roman creed will seem to us doubly great and venerable.<sup>3</sup>

Considering, then, the contrast presented by the Christian religion to that of pagan Rome, the most striking and essential distinctions appear to be those herein pointed out. Christianity is essentially moral; but morality—and high morality—was also introduced into paganism by teachers of philosophy.

Christianity taught the doctrine of a Divine Sonship and Incarnation; but analogous views were common in various pagan forms of religion. It taught also the resurrection of a Divine Sufferer; but that, in other shapes, was the accepted belief of multitudes.

It taught contempt for honors, riches, and worldly pleasures; but the same was taught by the Stoics and the Cynics.

It propagated its creed without the aid of, and in opposition to, the Roman State; but many Oriental religions did the same thing. Thus it appears to me that the two most striking differences between paganism and Christianity—differences, therefore, which must be held to be most essential—were the possession by the Christian

Church of (1) catholicity and (2) authority. Such authority also, when it first appears on the field of history, shows itself, as it were, crystallizing round the person at the head of the Roman Church—as was natural, for the Romans were the born legislators and governors of the world.

But if the most apparent of all the distinctions between paganism and Roman Christianity in its earliest period are catholicity and authority, what is the distinctive character of that Christianity to-day? We have still a Church which differs from all other religious bodies by the same two essential marks (1) catholicity and (2) authority, and which is unquestionably the direct and uninterrupted descendant of the primitive Church at Rome. Other religious bodies may share with it this or the other group of doctrines or of practices, but there is not one other which dares to affirm that it *alone* is catholic, and that it *alone* possesses *absolute* dogmatic authority. The Church also which solely asserts these claims is now, as in the second century, the Church of the Roman communion, and regards with respect and deference the Roman Pontiff.

There are persons who presume to apply the term "Italian mission" to the English Church in communion with Rome, as if that term was a term of opprobrium, or at least denoted some inferiority of status. But the members of that Church glory in such a title, and declare that it is by God's unmerited mercy they have the inexpressible privilege of being *Roman* Catholics. They are an Italian mission, and the aims of that mission they strive to fulfil. I am far, indeed, from feeling any desire for the destruction of the Anglican Church. I recognise the important and beneficent rôle it fulfils, and have the highest respect for many of its ministers. My recollection of its action in my own regard demands my gratitude. Nevertheless the duty to bear witness to truth admits of no compromise. I feel, therefore, compelled to call my readers' attention to the fact that there was *another* Italian mission, that of St. Augustine, whence arose the English Church as it existed till the reign of Henry the Eighth. Up to the year 1534 its prelates and priests had also dutifully striven to fulfil the Italian mission they had received, but then they shamefully abandoned it, setting aside, *in despite of authority*, that Church organisation they had themselves ever regarded as essential,<sup>1</sup> thus also cutting themselves off from the other character of catholicity.

Thus both the Anglican Church and the English Roman Church were "Italian missions," but they differ essentially in the fact that the former was

<sup>1</sup> Thus Archbishop Courtenay in the Archiepiscopal Commission of 1382, wherein seven bishops (one of them William of Wykeham), with thirty-seven leading theologians, co-operated, declared the doctrine that the English Church should exist under its own laws, and not subject to the Pope, to be an *heretical* proposition. See the *Tablet*, August 26, 1893, p. 327.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 167.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 162.

<sup>3</sup> See *Nineteenth Century* for July, 1893, p. 175.

and is, while the latter is not, faithless to its mission.

We must now, in conclusion, say a few words as to the positive influence of antecedent paganism on the Christianity which sprang up amongst it. As most of my readers probably know, M. Ernest Havet, in his work *Le Christianisme et ses Origines*, endeavours to show that Christianity was nothing more than the natural, inevitable outcome of the mingling of Hellenism and Judaism with Roman life under the conditions existing at the time. This M. Boissier entirely denies.<sup>1</sup> He admits that it developed under favourable (the Theist must term them "providential") circumstances, as we have here endeavoured to show, and it can hardly be denied that it came at the very moment most profitable for its success. As Prudentius says—

Christo jam tum venienti,  
Crede, parata via est.

Christianity profited by its environment, but was not thereby generated. That system (as shown, for example, in St. Paul's epistle to the Romans) is as radically distinct from Hellenism as from Roman paganism, and carried forward to an otherwise impossible consummation the reforms and religious ameliorations which arose in the pagan world. But, as we have said,<sup>2</sup> philosophy and religion had raised questions which they could not solve, and aspirations they could not satisfy, while complete solution and abundant satisfaction were afforded to those who accepted the Christian faith.

Judaism was the dawn which announced the near advent of the "Sun of Justice," but the fulfilment of its law was only accomplished by breaking away from what was its central principle, as Judaism. The essence of Christianity, as we have seen, consisted for one thing in its catholicity; but Judaism was, and is, essentially a racial religion, and therefore incapable of universal extension. It was also too devoid of dogma to fulfil the requirements of that age, since it consisted in little more than the assertion of God's unity and the fact that the Jews were His chosen people. Every Jew will admit that their sacred formula, "Hear, O Israel: the Lord thy God is one God," contains the essence of Judaism.

As to Hellenism, that it also contributed its share to the development of Christianity no reasonable man would wish to deny. The Christian Church, as it exists in the concrete in every region of the world's surface, receives, and must receive modifications from its environment; but accidental modification and essential transformation are very different things.

We have seldom been so forcibly impressed with the way in which an author's prejudices can dis-

tort his judgment, as in our perusal of M. Havet's work. His ignorance of the Christian Church is also curious. He represents it as claiming that its rites and ceremonies and its pious practices are due to special and extraordinary revelations, instead of having arisen as acts responding to and supplying natural human wants. He details a number of pagan customs to which a variety of Christian mediæval customs conform, and he, with almost incredible absurdity, represents the latter as having directly followed from the former. But every tiro of ecclesiastical history knows that a long interval intervened between the cessation of such pagan customs and the development of analogous Christian ones. It would be as absurd to believe in a direct filiation, instead of a mere relation of analogy between such practices, as to believe that the pillar of St. Simeon Stylites was a mere imitation of the long antecedent one of the priest of Astarte. As in the organic world we continually meet with (as it has been my special function to point out) the "independent origin of similar structures," so also in the domain of human history we continually meet with "the independent origin of similar customs." This circumstance needs no elaborate theory for its explanation; it follows, as it might be expected to follow, from the simple fact that there is a great deal of human nature in every one of us.

#### TATIAN AND THE DATE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.<sup>1</sup>

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS.

*From The Contemporary Review* (London), December, 1893.

It is sixteen years, almost to a moon (which is the unit of measurement of time to the readers of the *CONTEMPORARY REVIEW*), since Bishop Lightfoot concluded in this magazine the series of articles in which he examined the claims of the anonymous work entitled "Supernatural Religion." These essays have since been reprinted in book-form; and amongst those, of all schools of belief or of non-belief, who value exactness of thought and accuracy of expression in matters relating to Biblical and Patristic science, they have already attained the dignity of a position amongst the classical works of modern theology.

It is, however, interesting to observe that, although no serious error has been detected in Lightfoot's reasonings, nor any fault been pointed out in the foundation of facts on which he built, there are some portions of his argument which, while not invalidated, are, in view of the progress which Patristic studies have been quietly making, inadequate in their statements, needing at least amplification and, in one or two minor points, a slight revision. I do not think that any articles

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. p. 400. <sup>2</sup> *Ante*, p. 12.

<sup>1</sup> By permission of The Leonard Scott Publication Company.

written by Lightfoot will ever come under the designation of "back numbers" which is popularly used by a great people on the other side of the Atlantic to describe the dead or dying past. There is very little in his writings over which a literary *Requiescat in pace* has to be said; his books will be as long-lived as those of the great masters of English theological learning, to which they stand in the relation of a carved capital to a column; they will remain the delight and the despair of critics and controversialists. At the same time, so large has been the increment to the materials for our knowledge of the early centuries of the Christian Church in the last few years that it becomes a proper question to ask, whether, in view of the new documents and inscriptions which have come to light, and the investigations of the sixteen intervening years to which we have alluded, the positions which Lightfoot took up are perfectly defensible. If, for example, he were alive to-day, would he be able to say as decidedly as he did that no case had been made out for assigning the Gospel of John to the latter half of the second century, or to any period of time except that defined by the early and almost unbroken tradition of the Church? Was Lightfoot's defence of the Fourth Gospel the last despairing effort of a dying orthodoxy? or was it a timely protest, made in harmony with the traditions of the finest English scholarship, against an inundation of mere German hypothesis?

Some of these questions are answered almost as soon as they are stated. The footnotes to the collected volume of Essays show that Lightfoot did not die without knowing that he had neither run in vain nor spent his strength for nought; he lived to see the learned world hard at work upon the greatest Patristic discovery of the century, the lost Harmony of Tatian, for the existence of which he had so zealously contended; and he did not live long enough to attend the literary funeral of St. John, which has, in consequence of the recovery of the Harmony, as well as for other reasons, been postponed indefinitely. He must have felt before he died that he had occupied the place of honor in a memorable conflict; and he, who probably least of all men cared for the fluctuations of popular opinion, was with us long enough to know that the flowing tide was with him. Readers of this Review will recall an article by Professor Schürer in September, 1891,<sup>1</sup> in which the following significant call to retreat was sounded to those who are named by compliment the advanced critics (chiefly so named, I imagine, because they have a tendency to run ahead of the facts of the case which they discuss). Professor Schürer told us that "those who dispute

the genuineness of St. John's Gospel have given up a number of Baur's untenable assertions. It is recognised that the Gospel is *at least* some thirty or forty years older than Baur admitted, that it arose not 160-170 A.D., but *at latest* about 130 A.D." (I have used some italics in the transcription of the sentence.) Schürer's article was meant as an olive-branch to the opposite critical schools.

Professor Sanday followed Dr. Schürer<sup>2</sup> in an article which maintained strongly the case for the antiquity of the Fourth Gospel, and declared the admission as to the date to be insufficient. I hope I do not express myself too strongly in saying that Professor Sanday's article, done into brief English, almost amounted to this: "Take back your olive-branch and bring a flag of surrender instead."

But I only refer to these articles in order to confirm what was said above in regard to the change which has come over the critical world in the matter of the Johannine question. I do not wish to build any further conclusions than this on the arguments or admissions of the two distinguished scholars cited. They occupied themselves chiefly with the discussion of the internal probabilities of the genuineness of St. John's Gospel, to the exclusion, almost entirely, of the external evidence and the ecclesiastical tradition. It would have been better to stay a while longer by these latter, which constitute the real facts of the case, at all events in regard to the antiquity of the book. Let it be noted then that there seems to be a change of opinion abroad on the question of the Fourth Gospel, and that the new conclusions suggest that Lightfoot's defence was a successful one.

To a good chess-player the interest of the game does not lie in the opening or closing moves; the former are usually conventional, the latter are self-evident; the "gameness" of the game is centered in a limited number of moves which do not attract the attention of an unskilled bystander; the moderate player is most interested in the selection and development of the opening gambit, and the tyro finds his joy in the closing passages which enable him to say which of the two sides has won. And the Johannine question is something like a game of chess in this respect; a certain number of objections have been, from time to time, urged against the supposed antiquity of the book; it is said to be ill-attested, or the actual attestations are said to be themselves spurious in character or wrongly assigned as to date. A large part of the literature of the second century has met with similar treatment: this is the conventional opening of the critical game. To one who is conversant with the literature of modern criticism, such statements produce no more excitement than to be told that one's adversary in a

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted in CHRISTIAN LITERATURE, October, 1891.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* November, 1891.

game of chess has moved his pawn to the king's fourth. The supreme interest of Lightfoot's work, on the other hand, consists in the fact that his moves constitute the turning-point of the struggle. All the rest of the controversy is either mere preliminary or foregone conclusion. I propose to point out, however, where he somewhat understated his case, and that the game might in reality have been much shorter; and I shall also draw attention briefly to some curious critical conclusions which follow from the conjunction of Lightfoot's work with the documents that have been discovered, and the discussions that have taken place upon them, since the publication of his memorable articles.

I begin by reconstructing the critical question into the shape in which it stood when Lightfoot began to take part in it. An extract or two will show which way the wind was blowing at that time. In the year before the appearance of Lightfoot's first article there was issued the fifth edition of Reuss's "History of the New Testament." No one will object, I hope, if I speak of Reuss as a temperate as well as a careful writer. In his preface to the edition in question he complains of those critics who decorate him with the title of "petty apologist," because he is unable to see all the seams which modern criticism has detected in the patchwork of the Apostolic writings; yet this is the way in which Reuss expressed himself on the important question of the external evidence for St. John's Gospel:

"The positive testimony [says he] does not begin, as the history of the Canon shows, until Theophilus of Antioch, after 170 A.D. But the universal recognition of the book by the Church immediately thereafter, sufficiently attested, would be inexplicable did it not reach back much farther. . . . The unspeakable pains that have been taken to collect external evidence only shows that there is none in the proper sense of the term."

For a companion sentence to Reuss's decided language we will take a few words from Dr. S. Davidson's "Canon of the Bible," the second edition of which appeared in 1877 synchronously with Lightfoot's concluding article on Tatian. The book to which I refer is stated to be a revision of an essay prepared for the new edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and so may fairly be taken to represent the sincere milk of the word for the sustenance of the coming generation. Dr. Davidson says (p. 99):

"Whatever may be said about Justin's acquaintance with this Gospel (*i. e.*, the Fourth Gospel), its existence before 140 A.D. is incapable either of decisive or probable showing. The Johannine authorship has receded before the tide of modern criticism; and, though this tide is arbitrary at times, it is here irresistible. Apologists should abstain from strong assertions, &c."

The metaphorical language of the passage is a little obscure; one does not at first see what is meant by St. John's Gospel receding before

modern criticism; but it is clear that the conservative critics must have been in an evil case if they had to deal with irresistible tides, or to stand, like Horace's countryman, by the banks of the mighty stream which flowed by the walls of Tübingen, and to wait until it should have dried up:

"Rusticus expectat dum defluant amnis: at ille  
Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum."

It will be observed that while Reuss had only ventured to fix an inferior limit for the date of St. John's Gospel (a proceeding which left the whole question at issue still open), Dr. Davidson went so far as to fix a superior limit (which would be necessarily the death-blow to the Johannine authorship), and even to intimate that the tide of critical knowledge would not be permitted to "turn again home." At the same time he warned apologists against strong assertions, from which it is at least fair to conclude that he was not conscious of having overstated his own case!

It will hardly need to be said that, of the statements which I have quoted, neither will bear repetition in view of the additions that have been made to our documentary knowledge; the only thing that will bear repeating is Reuss's admission that the "universal recognition of the book by the Church immediately" after the time of Theophilus "would be inexplicable did it not reach back much further." The external testimony to St. John's Gospel does not begin with Theophilus, nor even with Tatian, who is historically his senior; it is no longer lawful to say that, anterior to Theophilus, the external evidence is practically non-existent; and it is extremely doubtful whether any person, who is even moderately acquainted with the subject, would to-day fix the lower limit for St. John's Gospel at the year 140, to say nothing of turning the lower limit into an upper limit. And now let us come to Lightfoot, and see how far his statements with regard to the antiquity of the Gospel of John are susceptible of verification, especially in the matter, so hotly contested, of the existence of a Harmony of the four Gospels, made by Tatian in the second century, which gave the story of the Gospels in the form of a mosaic made by alternate extracts from one Gospel or another, and known in the early Church by the name of the Diatessaron or Quarternary Gospel.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Readers to whom the literature of the subject is unfamiliar will perhaps care to be reminded that the existence of this Gospel Harmony, which contained nearly the whole of the Fourth Gospel, was denied in the strongest terms. M. Renan said, in 1879 (three years after the publication of Ephrem's "Commentary on the Harmony," in its Latin form):

"Tatian ne connaissait pas ou n'admettait pas l'Évangile de Jean. C'est à tort qu'on a cru que le Diatessaron commençait par 'Au commencement était le Verbe.' C'est à tort aussi qu'on a cru que le titre *Δια τεσσάρων* impliquait les quatre Évangiles canoniques. Le mot *Δια τεσσάρων* est emprunté à la musique grecque et signifie en général l'accord parfait."—"L'Eglise Chrétienne," p. 503, n.

The author of "Supernatural Religion" said: "No one seems to have seen Tatian's Harmony, probably for the very simple reason that there was no such work, and the real Gospel used by him was that according to the Hebrews. . . . As we have clearly seen, there is not up to



It is well known that this Diatessaron of Tatian has come to light in two leading forms, which are obviously derived from a lost primitive—the first is the Armenian translation of Ephrem Syrus's Commentary on the Diatessaron, in which a large part of the Diatessaron is embedded; the second, the Diatessaron itself, has appeared in an Arabic translation made from a ninth-century copy of a lost Syriac text. Over and above these two leading authorities, a mass of references and quotations, whose number is constantly increasing, have been unearthed in the extant literature of the early Syrian Church and elsewhere.

Now, while Lightfoot was writing, the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus, which had been published by the Armenian Fathers at Venice as early as 1836, was actually on his shelves. He has himself confessed as much in a foot-note at the close of the "Collected Essays":

"I had for some years possessed a copy of this work in four volumes and the thought had more than once crossed my mind that possibly it might throw light on Ephrem's mode of dealing with the Gospels. . . . I did not, however, then possess sufficient knowledge of Armenian to sift its contents."

Moreover, this Armenian text had been translated into Latin and published by Dr. Mössinger, of Salzburg, in the year before this article of Lightfoot was written. Mössinger's book would have told the whole tale about the Diatessaron, but, unhappily, it remained practically unnoticed until the great American scholar, Dr. Ezra Abbot, brought it to the front in a masterly essay on the Fourth Gospel.

It must be admitted that if Lightfoot had been able to quote Ephrem's text, or to refer to Mössinger's translation of it, and to extract the elements of the Gospel on which Ephrem was commenting, he would have made his case much stronger. To take a single point, the production of a text of the Gospels, which was obviously harmonistic and began with John i. 1 ("In the beginning was the Word"), would have been a fact of more weight than fifty arguments on the question as to whether Dionysius Bar-Salibi spoke the truth when he said that Mar Ephrem had written an exposition of the Diatessaron, and that its commencement was "In the beginning was the Word." It appears, therefore, that Lightfoot defended his case from a weaker position than was accessible to him.

What is true of Ephrem's Commentary is also true in a lesser degree of the Arabic version of the Harmony, which was published at Rome in

1888, accompanied by a Latin translation. It is well known now that, as far back as the middle of the last century, this copy of the Diatessaron had been announced in the printed catalogue of the Arabic manuscripts in the Vatican Library. Not only was it announced, but announced as Tatian's Diatessaron. I do not mean to imply that Lightfoot was to blame more than other people in not having noticed or followed up the entry which Assemani had made of this precious MS.; but I do say that it is much to be regretted that so much valuable time had to be spent in unfruitful disputes which ought to have been settled long ago by a little printer's ink applied to non-controversial ends. And certainly it must be allowed that Lightfoot's defence of Tatian, however adequate in other respects, was, in consequence of the non-publication of an extant and catalogued document, much understated.

The third point to which I wish to call attention is an instance in which Lightfoot threw away an important piece of testimony which lay at hand. I refer to the evidence of Victor of Capua, who had, somewhere about the year 545 A. D., found an anonymous Harmony of the Gospels, which he decided, on comparison with Eusebius, to be the Harmony made by Tatian in the second century, and which he used as a basis of a Latin Harmony of his own, which has come down to us in the famous Codex Fuldensis. On this identification of Victor's, Lightfoot remarks:

"There can be no doubt that Victor was mistaken about the authorship; for, though the work is constructed on the same general plan as Tatian's, it does not begin with John i. 1, but with Luke i. 1, and it does contain the genealogies" (which tradition affirms to have been absent from the original work of Tatian).

It was strange that Lightfoot did not notice or suspect that there had been an alteration in the Harmony by its passage through the hands of Victor of Capua. But Victor, though he had re-arranged the harmonised Gospel, preserved the original table of chapters, which he prefixed to his own work, though it did not exactly correspond thereto. In this table of chapters it is seen at a glance that the original Harmony, upon which he worked in framing his Latin-Vulgate Harmony, did begin with John i. 1, and contained, as far as we can judge, no genealogies. We are justified, then, in saying that Lightfoot understated the existing evidence for the Harmony of Tatian (and the Gospel of John which is contained in it); I make this statement, not with the idea of depreciating, on mere points of detail, the splendid vindication of the early Christian writings which Lightfoot so successfully accomplished, but simply in order to enunciate the following proposition, which may be of value in coming days:

the time of Tatian any evidence even of the existence of three of our Gospels, and much less of the four in a collected form."

Dr. S. Davidson was not much better; he told us: "It is now impossible to ascertain the nature of his Harmony. . . . It may have been made out of the four canonical Gospels. But the testimony of one that did not see the book is little worth. . . . The accounts of the Syrian writers furnish no proof that Tatian's work began with John i. 1."—"Introduction to New Testament," ii. 396.

*It is possible for a professed apologist, acting in defence of a certain portion of the Christian literature, the genuineness of which has been attacked, to seriously understate a winning case.*

I hope that Dr. Davidson, who has been so free in his warnings to the apologists, will not consider this too strong a statement.

Let me now pass on to consider a little more generally what is likely to be the effect of the recovery of Tatian's Harmony upon the Johannine problem. In the first place it will react upon the opinions which are current with regard to supposed quotations from St. John's Gospel in second-century writers. I will begin by taking the case of Tatian himself. If we turn to the "Apology to the Greeks," which is the only one of Tatian's own writings that has been preserved to us, we shall find several passages in which it has been common for apologists to recognise traces of the use of the Fourth Gospel. Three places, in particular, have been appealed to; in the first he uses the expression, "God is a spirit;" in the second he quotes the saying, "The darkness comprehended not the light," and in the third he expresses himself as follows: "Follow ye the only God. All things have been made by Him, and apart from Him hath been made no one thing;" of these supposed references two are verbatim and the third almost so.

Now, it is manifestly absurd to question the identification of these allusions to St. John's Gospel when once we have recognised that Tatian was so well acquainted with the Fourth Gospel as to have transcribed the whole of it at least once, and to have carefully examined the relation of the contained narrative to that given in the Synoptic Gospels. The Harmony has a broad back; if we are discussing the question of possible acquaintance with St. John's Gospel, it can carry these smaller quotations as easy as a bird carries its feathers. It is, however, to be remembered that these quotations were all called in question; not one of them, for example, was admitted by the author of "Supernatural Religion." He devotes six pages to the demonstration that the passages referred to have nothing in common with the Fourth Gospel. It is fair to remember that this writer had also come to the conclusion that there was no evidence that the Diatessaron of Tatian was based upon the four canonical Gospels.

We thus arrive at the following interesting situation: *It is possible for an early Christian writer, profoundly acquainted with the Fourth Gospel, which he had at least once transcribed with his own hand, to write a religious treatise in which he would fail to convince critics in later ages that he had any acquaintance with that Gospel at all. And this possibility is consistent with the fact that he makes verbatim quotations from the author with whom he is held to have been unacquainted.*

We can scarcely doubt that the recovery of the Tatian Harmony will lead to the ungrudging admission that Tatian shows an acquaintance with the Gospel of John in the rest of his writings. Nor will the influence of the Diatessaron in criticism be limited to Tatian's own writings. Let us recall the sentence which we quoted a little while back from Reuss, to the effect that the evidence of the use of the Fourth Gospel by Theophilus, taken with the universal recognition of St. John by the Church immediately following Theophilus, would be inexplicable if it did not reach back much farther. Tatian is Theophilus's senior, and his name may now be read for Theophilus by those who belong to the school of Reuss. We may now speak of the universal recognition of the Fourth Gospel by the Church immediately after Tatian, and affirm that this would be inexplicable unless the Fourth Gospel reached much farther back. But how vastly is this argument strengthened when we remember that we are not reasoning from a single admitted quotation in the writings of Tatian. *The quotation in question is now the book itself;* and not merely have we in the Harmony a transcription of the Gospel, but a transcription that involves long and patient thought and study. It certainly looks as if the superior limit of time assigned by Davidson had gone away "in die Ewigkeit." But if the existence of the Harmony compels the recognition of contemporary quotations in Tatian's own writings, it must operate in a similar manner in the period before Tatian; for the existence of the Harmony is the same thing as the pre-existence of the Gospels harmonised. And this argument will be most forcible, critically, in the line of Tatian's own intellectual and spiritual ancestry, for here we are most sure of finding the antecedent Gospels. We must expect, then, to find that Tatian's master, Justin, was acquainted with the four Gospels which his pupil had so carefully studied, and a new light is thus thrown upon the much discussed question as to whether there are any traces in Justin's writings of the use of the four Gospels and, in particular, of the Fourth Gospel. It will be a strange thing indeed if no such traces are to be found; some cases will probably be admitted. But even if we should by any chance find either in Justin or in Tatian, suggestions of acquaintance with an apocryphal fifth or sixth Gospel, from which Justin's language may sometimes be borrowed, we shall not on that account have diminished in the least the weight of the argument derived from the fact that, whatever else Tatian knew, he was well acquainted with the canonical Gospels, and from whatever other sources, in the shape of uncanonical Gospels, he drew his materials, from these four at least he drew practically all that was capable

of combination into the mosaic which he was making. The whole face of the question has been changed by the regression of the lower limit for St. John's Gospel which is involved in the recovery of the lost Harmony. In popular language, *the date of St. John's Gospel has gone back, and on that account a number of supposed quotations from St. John which were formerly considered doubtful must now be admitted.*

By the date of the Gospel of John, we mean the latest possible period to which it can be referred; for when we speak of the date of the Gospel of John, we imply one of three things: (a) the actual date when the book was written, concerning which we have a clear and harmonious ecclesiastical tradition, which takes us probably into the closing years of the first century; this date, of course, remains fixed; or, (β) we may mean the superior limit of time which criticism has assigned for its possible production, the formula for which is, "it cannot have been written *earlier* than the year —," and may, of course, be ever so much later; or (γ) we may mean the lower limit assigned by criticism, the formula for which is, "it must have been written *before* the year —." It has been the common practice of modern criticism to disregard the traditional evidence for an actual date, on the ground that tradition is untrustworthy, and to confine itself almost entirely to the determination of an inferior limit, to which it too often tacitly assumes that the superior limit is extremely close. But there is no warrant furnished, by the comparative study of similar problems in other literatures, for the assumption that the superior and inferior limits assigned to a work by processes of internal criticism are necessarily near together. The evidence furnished by the determination of a lower limit of production of a work is positive evidence, but it conflicts in no degree with the possibility of an earlier date; the case for the early date of St. John's Gospel is never a closed case until a superior limit has been fixed. Now the audacity of Dr. Davidson's criticism consisted in this: that it professed that the superior limit had been found within reasonable bounds of probability, and the amusing part of the present situation is that we find such an advanced critic as Schürer assigning an inferior limit for St. John within the region prohibited by Davidson's superior limit! And further, since the Schürer limit is by its very statement an inferior limit, it must not be interpreted as if it affirmed that the Gospel of John was written as late as 130 A. D., but that it cannot any longer be maintained to have been written later. All of which must be very good news to the apologists (of whom I do not profess to be one), and equally satisfactory to those who (like myself) know from their experience as investigators, or in

any other way, that the Catholic traditions have a peculiar habit of justifying themselves against those that impugn them.

Having said thus much with regard to the influence of the recovered Harmony on the question of the Fourth Gospel, I will conclude by pointing out the directions in which fresh light will shortly be forthcoming.

The first direction is, that we may expect before long to understand a great deal more than we do at present with regard to the origin of the variants of the New Testament text. We shall find that the greater part of them are already in existence in the second century, and that to some of them, at least, dates and authors can be assigned. Tatian will be responsible for not a few. What Dean Burgon said, in one of his attacks on the Revised Version, that "we are sometimes able to lay our finger upon a foul blot, and to say, 'This came from Tatian's Diatessaron,'" will be found to be verified; as well as his other crisp dictum, "Have you not yet found out, sir, that all various readings are ancient?" I need scarcely say that when we are able to attach a chronological indication to the variants, and to locate a great part of them in the second century, there will be small occupation left for those who wish to fix the period of origin of the Gospels as late as the demonstrable time of their greatest corruption. As an illustration of this subject for those to whom it may be new ground, I will trace back to the second century a single Greek variant of a very striking nature which I discovered in a Greek manuscript of the Gospels dating from the eleventh century, in the possession of Miss Algerina Peckover, of Wisbech. In this copy I found the account of our Lord's conversation with Peter over the question of the tribute money altered as follows: "Of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? Of their own children or of the aliens? Peter saith to him, Of the aliens. Jesus said to him, Then are the children free? Simon said Yes. Jesus saith to him, Then do thou also give, as being an alien to them."

When I first discovered this curious variant to the account in Matthew xvii. 26, I assigned the added matter to a Syriac origin; no other authority for it was extant beyond the single Greek manuscript to which I have referred, in which I had the pleasure of detecting it some years before I began the study of Tatian's Harmony. As soon, however, as I obtained possession of Ciasca's edition of the Arabic translation of Tatian's Syriac Harmony, I was delighted to find the same added matter in the text; and not only so, but I now see that it is also in Ephrem's Commentary, though it has been erroneously printed in the edition of Mösin-ger, as though it were a part of the Commentary itself, and not a part of his text. Here, then,

we have a case (and it is by no means a rare one) of a variant in the Greek Testament carried back to Tatian. We may confidently expect much more light in this direction. I am well aware that the critics, who write against the genuineness of Christian literature are, as a rule, quite superior to the science of textual criticism. Some of them will live to find out the mistake they are making. The problem of the origin of the Gospels belongs naturally to the textual critics, and without their co-operation, no one can be trusted to decide finally upon it.

The other direction in which fresh light is to be expected shortly is in regard to the question as to the relation between the Tatian Harmony and the Old Syriac Version of the Gospels. Between the two there is an intimate textual connection. Either Tatian used, in making his Harmony, this previously existing Syriac translation, in which case the lower limit of the Gospels must be pushed back another stage in order to allow for the preceding rendering from Greek into Syriac; or

this Syriac Version, in its earliest form, is a translation made with Tatian's text in the mind of the translator, and probably with a view to replace Tatian's work. In this case the Old Syriac Gospels become an important witness, if further testimony were needed, to the Diatessaron of Tatian.

Possibly a third alternative may be suggested—viz., that Tatian is responsible both for the translation and the harmonisation; in which case we should have their combined evidence, equivalent now to a single factor, in favor of the previously existing Greek Gospels. It is too soon yet to speak definitely of the nature of the solution of the problem. But I have little fear that any one will work at the subject, even for so short a time as six months, and retain in his mind any doubts as to whether the Gospel of John is an early product of the Christian literature. The more we know our Tatian the more we shall be persuaded that the Gospels were well established in the Christian Church when Tatian undertook to combine them.

## LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

### BOOK REVIEWS.

CONDUCTED BY REV. CHARLES R. GILLETT, LIBRARIAN OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

#### THE BRIGGS CASE REVIEWED.

"A stranger," whom it would be easy to name and whose identity can be easily discovered, has sent forth a "calm review" of *The Trial of Dr. Briggs before the General Assembly*. It comes from one who shows equipoise and sound judgment, and who, as a stranger and having no personal interest in the outcome of the trial, was well qualified to hear, see, consider and judge. He approached the case in a half-instructed attitude, but with a desire to apprehend its real merits. While inclined by education and training to the side of the prosecution, he could calmly examine the arguments which were adduced against the accused professor, and while opposed to the positions of the alleged heretic, as they had been represented in the public prints, he was not unwilling to hear those views expounded by the only one capable of so doing. The product of his seeing, studying and thinking is embodied in a handsome little book of 196 pages, in which he speaks briefly of the attitude occupied by the observer, the accused, and the Assembly. The charges are taken up in turn and examined as to their meaning and pertinence, and the essential arguments on either side are reviewed in their mutual bearings and in reference to the charges. The final part of the book is historical and documentary, and the whole is closed by a brief summary. A very interesting portion of the book consists in the citations of the opinions of the author's Princeton instructors in theology of twenty years ago, showing what the "orthodox" teaching of the time was. One is impressed with the danger in which Drs. Charles and Caspar Hodge and Professor Moffatt must have stood, had they lived, of being placed on trial for the expression of views which are now condemned by the Presbyterian General Assembly as heterodox. From this

point the author occasionally proceeds a step further, showing that the charge of contra-confessional teaching does not rest at all where it is popularly supposed to do.

The writer's claim to calmness is everywhere justified. He is fair and judicial, and he has produced a book which has the distinguishing characteristic of being perfectly clear and intelligible. In fact, it is the best and most discriminating presentation of the two sides of the case which has yet appeared. In all justice it should be widely read by those who would understand the case in its bearings and in its essential features. [Randolph, 50 cents, net.]

#### COMMENTARIES AND LESSON-HELPS.

Two recent volumes in the *Pulpit Commentary* series of Drs. Spence and Exell form a welcome addition to recent exegetical literature. One covers the prophecies of Amos, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah, and the other embraces Nahum Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai and Malachi. The series is too well and favorably known to require extended notice or special commendation. The method pursued is to give an exposition of the various sections of the text (those in the present volumes are by the Rev. W. J. Deane, well known through his studies on the Old Testament Apocrypha), and to follow with a section devoted to the homiletic features of the same passages. Special homilies by various authors are also given, forming a sort of symposium upon the whole. The American edition is identical with the English. [Randolph, 8vo, \$2.00 each.]

An exceedingly well arranged series of lesson helps has been prepared by Prof. E. B. Wakefield, of Hiram College, under the title *Standard Eclectic Commentary on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1894*. The Bib-



lical text is printed in such a way as to combine both versions, giving the reader the benefit of an easy comparison. An introduction precedes the exposition which is divided into sections to indicate the main lessons of the various passages. The final portion is intended for the teacher and contains helpful hints which have the spiritual benefit of the pupil in view. Each section contains also references to popular books which will be found useful by the earnest teacher. Fault might be found with some of the details of the volume, but its general plan and execution are so excellent that severe criticism is disarmed. [Standard Publishing Co.: Cincinnati. Guide Print. Co., Louisville. \$1.00.]

Another volume of the same sort is *The Westminster Question Book*. It is much briefer and of less value for the teacher, but is useful as a guide. [Presbyterian Board of Publication: Philadelphia. 15c.]

In the midst of the confusion attendant upon entrance into a new parish in London, Dr. George F. Pentecost has prepared another of his volumes of exposition of the International Sunday-School lessons. Those for 1894 relate to the Pentateuch and the Life of Christ. The aim has been to give explanations and applications of spiritual truths based upon the lessons. The critical element is absent, perhaps to the actual damage of the book from its own

standpoint. Nevertheless there is abundance of good thought and profitable suggestion. [*Bible Studies*. Revell Co., \$1.00.]

A volume of fruitful and suggestive exposition by the Rev. F. B. Meyer, is entitled *The Way Into the Holiest*. The Epistle to the Hebrews is the subject, and with his usual success the author points out many of "those great spiritual lessons which are enshrined in these sublime words." [Revell Co., \$1.00.]

#### "THE WITNESS TO IMMORTALITY"

by Rev. George A. Gordon, of the Old South Church, Boston, presents in simple, clear and sympathetic language mankind's testimony to the belief in immortality, gleaned from the world's choicest literature. "The present can find adequate explanation nowhere but in an endless future" is the underlying thought of the whole work. Assuming that life is desirable, he aims to give "not the completed proof of the eternal life, for that is impossible," but to place the facts clearly before the reader that he may pass upon them for himself. The treatment of the subject is literary, and the method is scientific to a degree that stops short of putting the matter beyond the reach of the ordinary reader. Objections are noticed and met in a manly spirit. [Houghton, Mifflin & Co., \$1.50.]

## INDEX TO RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

### ABBREVIATIONS OF MAGAZINE TITLES USED IN THIS INDEX.

Af. M. E. R.	African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)	M. H.	Missionary Herald.
A. R.	Andover Review. (Bi-monthly.)	Miss. R.	Missionary Review.
B. Q. R.	Baptist Quarterly Review.	N. C. Q.	New Christian Quarterly.
B. S.	Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)	N. H. M.	Newbury House Magazine.
B. W.	The Biblical World.	N. W.	The New World. (Quarterly.)
C. M. Q.	Canadian Methodist Quarterly.	O. D.	Our Day.
C. R.	Charities Review.	P. E. R.	Protestant Episcopal Review.
C. T.	Christian Thought. (Bi-monthly.)	P. M.	Preacher's Magazine.
Ch. Q. R.	Church Quarterly Review.	P. Q.	Presbyterian Quarterly.
Ex.	Expositor.	P. R. R.	Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
Ex. T.	Expository Times.	R. Q. R.	Reformed Quarterly Review.
G. W.	Good Words.	R. R. R.	Religious Review of Reviews.
H. R.	Homiletic Review.	S. M.	Sunday Magazine.
K. M.	Katholischen Missionen.	T. T.	The Thinker.
L. C. R.	Lutheran Church Review.	T. Tr.	The Treasury.
L. Q.	Lutheran Quarterly.	Y. R.	The Yale Review.
M. R.	Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)		

Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the December numbers of periodicals.

"A Little Child Shall Lead Them," Donald Macleod, GW.  
 Angels, The Song of the, E. E. Boroughs, TTr.  
 Apostolic Churches, The: Their Doctrine and Fellowship, VII., Robert A. Watson, PM.  
 Appeal to Our Readers, A Practical, RRR, Nov.  
 Aramaic Gospel, Prof. Marshall's, S. R. Driver, Ex.  
 Archaeological Notes, Professor Taylor, AR.  
 Armagh, The Late Archbishop of, Canon Crozier, RRR, Nov.  
 Atonement, The Epistle to the Hebrews on the, W. F. Adeney, TT.  
 Augustin, St., The Influence of, G. C. Foley, PER.  
 Babylonian Exile, The, Julius Wellhausen, NW.  
 Beni Hasan, J. Hunt Cooke, Ex.T.  
 Biblical Criticism in Some of its Theological and Philosophical Relations, I., BW, Nov.  
 "Born of the Virgin Mary," C. J. H. Ropes, AR.  
 Cader Idris, On the Slopes of, Wray W. Hunt, GW.  
 Calvinism, Dutch, Henry E. Dosker, HR.  
 Chaldee of Daniel compared with that of the Tarquins, The, J. E. H. Thomson, TT.  
 Christ, The Blood of, John F. Christian, TTr.  
 Christ, The Light of Man, P. J. Gloag, TT.  
 Christ, The Return to, A. W. Anthony, TTr.  
 Christ in Islam, D. S. Margoliouth, Ex.T.  
 Christ on Character, The Influence of, Lord Bishop of Ripon, GW.  
 Christian and Hindu Thought, The Contact of, Points

of Likeness and of Contrast, Robert A. Hume, MH.  
 Christian Ministry, The: Its Present Claim and Attraction, Professor Pease, AR.  
 Christianity, The Influence of, on the Physical Life of Mankind, E. M. Deems, TTr.  
 Christianity on the School Board, The Fight for, RRR, Nov.  
 Christ's Resurrection, The Relation of, to our Justification, James S. Candlish, Ex.  
 Church Organizations, The Multiplicity of, William A. Cook, HR.  
 Creeds, The Ethics of, Alfred Momerie, NW.  
 Criminals Not the Victims of Heredity, William M. F. Round, CT.  
 Daniel, The Chaldee of, compared with that of the Tarquins, J. E. H. Thomson, TT.  
 Deems, President Charles F., D.D., LL.D., CT.  
 Driftwood, H. Ricketts, TTr.  
 Education, An Oriental's View as to Female, MH.  
 Education and Missions, II., A. J. Gordon, MissR.  
 England, Notes from, Joseph King, AR.  
 Ethics of Creeds, The, Alfred Momerie, NW.  
 Faith, The Moral Eenergy of, A. B. Bruce, Ex.  
 Galatia of the Acts, The: A Criticism of Professor Ramsay's Theories, F. H. Chase, Ex.  
 God, The Kingdom of, in the Teaching of Jesus, III., H. H. Wendt, ExT.  
 Gospel that Is no Gospel, A, Robert F. Horton, PM.

- Gospels and Modern Criticism, The, Arthur Wright, ExT.  
 Greek Testament, Westcott and Hart's Text of the, tested by its Results, David Brown, TT.  
 Hebrews, The Epistle to the, on the Atonement, W. F. Adeney, TT.  
 Heresy in Athens in the Time of Plato, F. B. Tarbell, NW.  
 Higher Criticism, The, J. Hall, TT.  
 "His Name Shall Be called Jesus," Benjamin Waugh, SM.  
 Historical Character of the Narratives of the Patriarchs, I., Lewis B. Paton, BW., Nov.  
 Idealism, The Ethical and Religious Import of, May Sinclair, NW.  
 Immigration of Aliens, Arnold White, CR.  
 Inspiration in the Old Testament, H. G. Mitchell, CT.  
 Inspiration, The Bible Doctrine of, B. B. Warfield, CT.  
 Inspiration under Review, J. J. Lampe and W. W. McLane, CT.  
 Israelites in Egypt, The Sojourn of the, Arthur C. Hewey, Ex.  
 Jesus, The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of, III., H. H. Wendt, ExT.  
 Jesus, The Self-Consciousness of, II., T. H. Root, B. W., Nov.  
 John, St., Exposition, of the First Epistle of, Richard Rothe, ExT.  
 John's Theology, The Peculiarities of, George B. Stevens, NW.  
 Jowett, Benjamin, W. Berkley, ExT.  
 Judging by their Fruits, MH.  
 Keller Institute in Denmark, A Visit to the, Frederick Starr, CR.  
 Keswick, Student Volunteers at, D. L. Pierson, MissR.  
 Keswick at Home, Geo. Wilson, ExT.  
 Lazarus, A Type of Israel, Joseph Labinowitz, MissR.  
 Lokoja, The Men Who Died at, A. R. Buckland, SM.  
 Luke xvi., 1-13, An Exposition of, S. W. Whitney, HR.  
 Marriage Tie, The Theory of the, Samuel W. Dike, AR.  
 Medical Mission, The Deptford, William C. Preston, GW.  
 Memory, The Ethics of, Augustine S. Carman, HR.  
 Metlakatla, A Marvel Among Missions, II., D. L. Leonard, MissR.  
 Missionary, Experience of Twenty-five Years, Impressions from a, Alpheus N. Andrus, MH.  
 Missionary Interest Among His People, The Responsibility of the Pastor for the Development of a, A. T. Pierson, HR.  
 Missions and Colonies, II., C. C. Starbuck, AR.  
 Missions in Palestine, Arthur W. Payne, MissR.  
 Missions in Syria, Evangelical, Geo. A. Ford, MissR.  
 Missions of the Church, Home, X., RRR, Nov.  
 Miracles, Some Minor, G. A. Chadwick, Ex.  
 Modern Criticism, The Gospels and, Arthur Wright, ExT.  
 Monastery of Peterborough, The Saxon, Lord Bishop of Worcester, GW.  
 Moses: His Life and its Lessons, XVII., Mark Guy Pearse, PM.  
 Nonconformist Endowments, G. H. F. Nye, RRR, Nov.  
 Old Testament Theology, Schultz's, W. P. McKee, BW, Nov.  
 One God, One Sanctuary: Is Wellhausen Right? W. L. Baxter, TT.  
 Ought Clergymen to Insure their Lives? I., RRR, Nov.  
 Palestine, Missions in, Arthur W. Payne, MissR.  
 Palestine, Some Notes from, A. Walker, BW, Nov.  
 Parliament, A Pen Picture of the, Florence E. Winslow, CT.  
 Parliament of Religions, Lessons from the, Lyman Abbott, CT.  
 Parliament of Religions, The, C. H. Toy, NW.  
 Parliament of Religions and the Christian Faith, The, D. S. Schaff, HR.  
 Pattern in 'the Mount, The, II., The Covenants, W. Millian, TT.  
 Parliament of Religions, The, Thos. J. Packard, PER.  
 Patriarchs, Historical Character of the Narratives of the, I., Lewis B. Paton, BW, Nov.  
 Paul's Conception of Christianity, St., XII.: The Moral Energy of Faith, A. B. Bruce, Ex.  
 Paul's Mysticism, The Apostle, Edward V. Hincks, BW, Nov.  
 Pessimism, A. Plummer, TT.  
 Peter, St., The Gospel of, James M. Garnett, PER.  
 Philanthropic Institutions, X., RRR, Nov.  
 Plato's Conception of the Good Life, Bernard Bosanquet, NW.  
 Poor-laws in the West, Early, Charles R. Henderson, CR.  
 Reading, The Art of, XII., Canon Fleming, RRR, Nov.  
 Religion of the Chinese People, The, C. de Harlez, NW.  
 Reminiscences, I., Bishop Clark, PER.  
 Resurrection, The Relation of Christ's, to our Justification, James S. Candlish, Ex.  
 Schultz's Old Testament Theology, W. P. McKee, BW, Nov.  
 Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries, Light on, William Hayes Ward, HR.  
 Sermons, How Men Get their, John Edwards, PM.  
 "Side-Tracking the XXXIX. Articles," Hall Harrison, PER.  
 Socialism, The New, and Economics, William B. Weedon, NW.  
 Stundists, Types of, III., SM.  
 Syria, Evangelical Missions in, Geo. A. Ford, MissR.  
 Tennyson's "In Memoriam," Studies in, Mary A. Woods, ExT.  
 "The Gift of God," Tyron Edwards, HR.  
 Theology, Thoroughness in, Richard A. Armstrong, NW.  
 "They Cried the More," Robert A. Watson, Ex.  
 Thoroughness in Theology, Richard A. Armstrong, NW.  
 Tramps, John J. McCook, CR.  
 Unspeakable Gift, The, M. H. MacLeod, TTR.  
 Warfield, Dr. B. B., Replies to His Critics, CT.  
 Westcott and Hart's Text of the Greek Testament Tested by its Results, David Brown, TT.  
 Whittier, John G., What the Ministry May Learn from the Character and Works of, J. Murray, HR.  
 Women, The Progress of, C. A. Channer, GW.  
 Women of Egypt, Work Among the, Miss A. Y. Thompson, MissR.  
 Y. M. C. A. in the Universities of India, The, L. D. Wishard, MissR.

## CONTENTS OF PERIODICALS.

### The Andover Review.

BOSTON, NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1893.

- The Christian Ministry: Its Present Claim and Attraction.  
 The Theory of the Marriage Tie.  
 Missions and Colonies. II.  
 "Born of the Virgin Mary."  
 Archæological Notes.

### The Atlantic Monthly.

JANUARY, 1894.

- Philip and His Wife. I.-III. Margaret Deland.  
 Admiral Earl Howe. A. T. Mahan.  
 The Only Rose. Sarah Orne Jewett.  
 Talk at a Country House. Sir Edward Strachey.  
 Marina Sings. Helen Gray Cone.  
 Ten Letters from Coleridge to Southey.  
 From Winter Solstice to Vernal Equinox. Edith M. Thomas.  
 Helen. Edward A. Uffington Valentine.  
 Wolfe's Cove. Mary Hartwell Catherwood.  
 Samuel Chapman Armstrong. John H. Denison.

His Vanished Star. XIV., XV. Charles Egbert Craddock.  
The Transmission of Learning through the University.  
N. S. Shaler.

**The Biblical World.**

CHICAGO, NOVEMBER, 1893.

The Apostle Paul's Mysticism.  
Biblical Criticism in Some of its Theological and Philosophical Relations. I.  
The Historical Character of the Narratives of the Patriarchs. I.  
The Self-Consciousness of Jesus. II.  
Schultz's Old Testament Theology.  
Some Notes from Palestine.

**The Century Magazine.**

NEW YORK, JANUARY, 1894

Old Dutch Masters: Frans Hals. Timothy Cole.  
The Year's Day. Frank Dempster Sherman.  
Pudd'nhead Wilson. II. Mark Twain.  
Garfield and Conkling. Henry L. Dawes.  
The Vanishing Moose. Madison Grant.  
Out of Her Class. Charles Belmont Davis.  
Life in a Lighthouse (Minor's Ledge). Gustav Kobbé.  
Andrew Lang. Brander Matthews.  
The Masquerade of Time. Edith M. Thomas.  
A No-Account Creole. Kate Chopin.  
The Convict Women of Port Blair. Laura E. Richards.  
The Bible and the Assyrian Monuments. Morris Jastrow, Jr.  
Sir James Simpson's Introduction of Chloroform. Eve Blantyre Simpson.  
Indian Songs: Personal Studies of Indian Life. Alice C. Fletcher.  
The Function of the Poet. James Russell Lowell.  
Robert Schumann. Edward Grieg.  
A Journey to the Devil's Tower. Thomas Moran.  
Notable Women: George Sand. Th. Bentzon (Mme. Blanc).

**The Charities Review.**

NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1893.

Tramps.  
Immigration of Aliens.  
E Visit to the Keller Institute in Denmark.  
Aarly Poor-Laws in the West.

**Christian Thought.**

DECEMBER, 1893.

President Charles F. Deems, D.D., L.L.D.  
The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration.  
Inspiration in the Old Testament.  
Inspiration Under Review.  
Criminals Not the Victims of Heredity.  
Dr. B. B. Warfield Replies to His Critics.  
Lessons from the Parliament of Religions.  
A Pen Picture of the Parliament of Religions.

**Die Katholischen Missionen.**

DECEMBER, 1893.

Eine Reise des Apostol. Delegaten Msgr. Zaleski längs der Malabar und Fischerküste.  
Auf dem Kilima-Ndscharo.  
Nachrichten aus den Missionen.

**The Expositor.**

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1893.

The Galatia of the Acts: A Criticism of Professor Ramsay's Theory.  
Professor Marshall's Aramaic Gospel.

St. Paul's Conception of Christianity. XII The Moral Energy of Faith.  
The Sojourn of the Israelities in Egypt.  
Some Minor Miracles.  
The Relation of Christ's Resurrection to Our Justification.  
"They Cried the More."

**The Expository Times.**

EDINBURGH, DECEMBER, 1893.

Benjamin Jowett.  
Christ in Islam.  
Keswick at Home. An Exposition of Recent Teaching on Holiness.  
The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. III.  
Beni Hasan.  
Studies in Tennyson's "In Memoriam."  
The Gospels and Modern Criticism.

**Good Words.**

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1893.

To Right the Wrong.  
The Saxon Monastery of Peterborough.  
On the Slopes of Cader Idris.  
The Deptford Medical Mission.  
Some Ancient and Modern Epigrams.  
The Progress of Women.  
"A Little Child Shall Lead Them."  
The Influence of Christ on Character.

**Harper's Magazine.**

NEW YORK, JANUARY, 1894.

Trilby. A Story. Part I. George DuMaurier.  
Egypt and Chaldea in the Light of Recent Discoveries.  
W. St. Chad Boscawen.  
Captain Napoleon Bonaparte at Toulon. Germain Bapst.  
The Dutch Influence in New England. William Elliot Griffis.  
Vignettes of Manhattan. II. A Midsummer Midnight.  
Brander Matthews.  
From Ispahan to Kurrachee. Edwin Lord Weeks.  
As Told to his Grace. II. Monsieur le Comte. William McLennan.  
The Mission of the Jews.  
A Royal Marriage. Geraldine Bonner.  
The Bread-and-Butter Question. Junius Henri Browne.  
The West and East Ends of London. Richard Harding Davis.  
Balaam and Pedro. Owen Wister.  
The Ending of Barstow's Novel. Helen Campbell.

**The Homiletic Review.**

NEW YORK, TORONTO, LONDON, DECEMBER, 1893.

What the Ministry may Learn from the Character and Works of John G. Whittier.  
The Responsibility of the Pastor for the Development of a Missionary Interest Among His People.  
Dutch Calvinism.  
The Ethics of Memory.  
Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries. XI.  
"The Shades of the Dead: Rephaim and Teraphim."  
An Exposition of Luke xvi., 1-13.  
"The Gift of God."  
The Parliament of Religions and the Christian Faith.  
The Multiplicity of Church Organizations.

**Lippincott's Magazine.**

PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1894

The Colonel. Harry Willard French.

The Peninsula of Lower California. James Knapp Reeve.  
 Frenchy. Molly Elliot Seawell.  
 Recollections. M. E. W. Sherwood.  
 The Trespasser. I., II., III. Gilbert Parker.  
 A Juvenile Revival. Thomas Chalmers.  
 Sunset in the Rockies. M. S. Paden.  
 A Poet of Manhood. Julian Hawthorne.  
 A Mother and Her Boy. George Morley.  
 Early Marriage Customs. Frank Shelley.  
 The Twentieth Century. Charles Morris.

#### McClure's Magazine.

NEW YORK, JANUARY, 1894.

Jules Verne at Home. Reported by R. H. Sherard,  
 Glimpses of Whittier's Faith and Character. Charlotte  
 Fiske Bates.  
 The Great White Chief. Gilbert Parker.  
 "Human Documents."  
 When She Was Thirty. Louise Chandler Moulton.  
 The Maxim Air-ship. H. J. W. Dam.  
 The Sabbath-breaker. I. Zangwill.  
 A Thousand-mile Ride on the Engine of the Swiftest  
 Train in the World. Cy Warman.  
 Francis Parkman. The Rev. Julius H. Ward.  
 "The Edge of the Future."  
 Reflections and Mottoes for the New Year.

#### The Missionary Herald.

BOSTON, DECEMBER, 1893.

Judging by Their Fruits.  
 An Oriental's View as to Female Education.  
 The Contact of Christian and Hindoo Thought: Points of  
 Likeness and of Contrast.  
 Impressions from a Missionary Experience of Twenty-  
 five Years.  
 Letters from the Missions.

#### The Missionary Review.

NEW YORK, TORONTO, LONDON, DECEMBER, 1893.

Education and Missions. II.  
 Metlakahtla, A Marvel Among Missions. II.  
 Lazarus. A Type of Israel.  
 Work Among the Women of Egypt.  
 Missions in Palestine.  
 Evangelical Missions in Syria.  
 The Y. M. C. A. in the Universities of India.  
 Student Volunteers at Keswick.  
 Missions at the World's Fair.  
 Causes of Improved Health of Missionaries to Africa.

#### The New World.

BOSTON, DECEMBER, 1893.

The Babylonian Exile.  
 The Peculiarities of John's Theology.  
 Plato's Conception of the Good Life.  
 The New Socialism and Economics.  
 The Religion of the Chinese People.  
 The Ethics of Creeds.  
 Heresy in Athens in the Time of Plato.  
 The Ethical and Religious Import of Idealism.  
 Thoroughness in Theology.  
 The Parliament of Religions.

#### The Preacher's Magazine.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1893.

A Gospel That Is No Gospel.  
 The Apostolic Churches: Their Doctrine and Fellowship.  
 VII.  
 Moses: His Life and its Lessons. XVII.  
 How Men Get Their Sermons.  
 Homiletics.

#### The Protestant Episcopal Review.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, DECEMBER, 1893.  
 Reminiscences. I.

The Influence of St. Augustin. I.  
 "Side-Tracking the XXXIX. Articles."  
 The Parliament of Religions.  
 The Gospel of Peter.

#### The Religious Review of Reviews.

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1893.

The Fight for Christianity on the School Board.  
 The Late Archbishop of Armagh.  
 Sonnet.  
 A Practical Appeal to Our Readers. I.  
 Nonconformist Endowments.  
 Ought Clergymen to Insure Their Lives? I.  
 The Art of Reading. XII.  
 Home Missions of the Church. X.  
 Philanthropic Institutions. X.

#### Scribner's Magazine.

NEW YORK, JANUARY, 1894.

Constantinople. F. Marion Crawford.  
 Deep Waters. W. G. Van Tassel Sutphen.  
 An Incurable Poet. Bliss Perry.  
 The Wolf at the Door. Charlotte Perkins Stetson.  
 The Actor. John Drew.  
 On Ne Badine Pas Avec La Mort. Arthur Sherburne  
 Hardy.  
 John March, Southerner. George W. Cable.  
 "Whither Thou Goest." Solomon Solis-Cohen.  
 Stories in Stone from Notre Dame. Theodore Andrea  
 Cook.  
 A Rainy Afternoon. George A. Hibbard.  
 Sir Joshua Reynolds. Frederick Keppel.  
 The Place of the Exodus in the History of Egypt. A. L.  
 Lewis.

#### The Sunday Magazine.

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1893.

One in Charity.  
 Alexandria.  
 Food and Gladness.  
 The Men Who Died at Lokoja.  
 The Length of a Street.  
 Types of Stundists. III.  
 The True Story of Evangeline. II.  
 Two Scenes in Child-History.  
 The South Arans.  
 The Right Ordering of Life.  
 Antonio Bertolini.  
 "His Name Shall Be Called Jesus."

#### The Thinker.

LONDON, NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1893.

The Chaldee of Daniel Compared With That of the  
 Tarquins.  
 The Westcott and Hort Text of the Greek Testament  
 Tested by Its Results. II.  
 One God, One Sanctuary: Is Wellhausen Right? III.  
 The Pattern in the Mount. II.  
 Christ, the Light of Man.  
 Pessimism.  
 The Epistle to the Hebrews on the Atonement.

#### The Treasury.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1893.

The Blood of Christ.  
 The Return to Christ.  
 Driftwood.  
 The Unspeakable Gift.  
 The Song of the Angels.  
 To What Extent Has the Higher Criticism Helped or  
 Hindered the Better Understanding of the Scriptures?  
 The Influence of Christianity on the Physical Life of  
 Mankind.